

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES

Byzantium, Latin Romania
and the Mediterranean

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

David Jacoby

Byzantium, Latin Romania
and the Mediterranean

Ashgate
VARIORUM

Aldershot · Burlington USA · Singapore · Sydney

This edition copyright © 2001 by David Jacoby.

Published in the Variorum Collected Studies Series by

Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House, Croft Road,
Aldershot, Hampshire GU11 3HR
Great Britain

Ashgate Publishing Company
131 Main Street
Burlington, Vermont 05401-5600
USA

Ashgate website: http://www.ashgate.com
--

ISBN 0-86078-844-X

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

Jacoby, David, 1928-

Byzantium, Latin Romania and the Mediterranean. – (Variorum Collected Studies Series: CS703).

1. Byzantine Empire-History-1081-1453. 2. Mediterranean Region-History-476-1517. 3. Romania-History-To 1711.

I. Title.

949. 5' 03

US Library of Congress Control Number: 20001088804

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.



Printed by St Edmundsbury Press, Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk

VARIORUM COLLECTED STUDIES SERIES CS703

CONTENTS

Preface		vii–ix
I	What do we learn about Byzantine Asia Minor from the Documents of the Cairo Genizah? <i>Η Βυζαντινή Μικρά Ασία (6ος–12ος αι.), Ἀθήνα, 1998</i> = <i>Byzantine Asia Minor (6th–12th cent.), ed. Sp. Vryonis, Jr. and N. Oikonomides (National Hellenic Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, International Symposium, 6 = The Speros Basil Vryonis Center for the Study of Hellenism. Hellenism: Ancient, Medieval and Modern, 27), Athens, 1998</i>	83–95
II	Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa <i>Oriente e Occidente tra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino, ed. L. Balletto. Acqui Terme, 1997</i>	517–540
III	Les Juifs de Byzance: une communauté marginalisée <i>Οι περιθωριακοί στο Βυζάντιο (Ίδρυμα Γουλανδρή – Χόρν), Ἀθήνα = Marginality in Byzantium (Goulandri-Horn Foundation), ed. Ch. A. Maltezou. Athens, 1993</i>	103–154
IV	The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland <i>Constantinople and its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993, eds. C. Mango and G. Dagron. Aldershot, Hampshire, 1995</i>	221–232
V	The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan Period <i>Vizantijskij Vremennik 55 (80). Moskva 1998</i>	31–40
VI	The Venetian Presence in the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261): the Challenge of Feudalism and the Byzantine Inheritance <i>Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik 43. Wien 1993</i>	141–201

VII	Venetian Settlers in Latin Constantinople (1204–1261): Rich or Poor? <i>Πλούσιοι καὶ φτωχοὶ στὴν κοινωνία τῆς ἑλληνολατινικῆς Ἀνατολῆς = Ricchi e poveri nella società dell'Oriente grecolatino (Biblioteca dell'Istituto Ellenico di Studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia, 19), ed. Ch. A. Maltezou. Venezia, 1998</i>	181–204
VIII	From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change <i>Mediterranean Historical Review 4 = Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204, eds. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby. London, 1989</i>	1–44
IX	Italian Migration and Settlement in Latin Greece: The Impact on the Economy <i>Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien 37 = Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als multikulturelle Gesellschaft. Einwanderer und Minderheiten im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert, ed. H.E. Mayer. München, 1997</i>	97–127
X	Silk crosses the Mediterranean <i>Le vie del Mediterraneo. Idee, uomini, oggetti (secoli XI–XVI), Genova, 19–20 aprile 1994 (Università degli studi di Genova, Collana dell'Istituto di storia del medioevo e della espansione europea, n. 1), ed. G. Airal di. Genova, 1997</i>	55–79
XI	The Jews and the Silk Industry of Constantinople <i>First Publication</i>	1–20
	Addenda and Corrigenda	1–5
	Index	1–12

This volume contains x + 338 pages

PREFACE

For more than forty years my research has focused on the eastern Mediterranean and dealt with various facets of its meeting and interaction with the West from the eleventh to the late fifteenth century. While proceeding with my work I have become increasingly convinced that a better understanding of political, social, economic, institutional and cultural developments in Byzantium, the crusader states established in the Levant around 1100, and neighbouring Muslim countries requires a truly Mediterranean perspective and a comparative approach. In other words, these developments must be examined both within the broadest possible contemporary context as well as in successive periods. This approach is already reflected to some extent in the four previous volumes of my collected studies published in the *Variorum Collected Studies Series*, respectively in 1975, 1979, 1989 and 1997. It is also present in the studies reproduced in the present volume, the choice of which has been largely determined by my interest in phenomena of continuity and change (incidentally, the subtitle of article no. VIII) in the long-term evolution of specific social groups and societies at large, of local, regional and inter-regional economic relations and evolution, as well as of institutional structures and legal rules.

At first glance the studies in this volume may appear to be narrowly focused, both with respect to the geographic area and the topics they cover. They deal primarily with the Byzantine area or Romania from the tenth to the fifteenth century. Several of them are concerned, whether entirely or partially, with the Empire in general or, more specifically, with its capital, Asia Minor or Crete (nos. I–V, VIII, X–XI). Others explore the Byzantine territories conquered by the Latins in the early thirteenth century (nos. V–X). Yet these articles also provide information on, and insights into Romania's relations with the West, the crusader states, and Egypt. Several of them illustrate the close links and interaction existing between developments in various fields, whether in Byzantine or former Byzantine areas: demographic and social mobility resulting from political, military and economic factors (nos. I, III–IX); economic processes, such as the intensification of trade and industrial production, changes in navigation routes, and the existence since the eleventh century of a triangular trade network linking the West with the various regions of the eastern Mediterranean and

each of these to the others (nos. I–II, V–XI); institutional and legal issues, such as the status of individuals and, on the other hand, collective privileges granted to the major maritime nations (II–III, VI–IX). Viewed in the perspective of continuity and change, there can be no doubt that the Fourth Crusade was a crucial event in the evolution of Romania. It resulted in major political and territorial changes affecting the Empire itself and the eastern Mediterranean region in general. It also contributed decisively to western demographic and commercial expansion and to the imposition of western political regimes, institutional structures and legal principles upon the territories conquered by the Latins. In various fields, however, the western impact was rather limited and there was a large degree of continuity (nos. VI–IX).

The last two articles (nos. X–XI) are concerned with silk economics, a field of inquiry almost completely neglected until recently. They explore silk production and trade within their proper historical and economic context, subjects that partly intersect with those mentioned above. These studies complement two previous articles on silk, already published in my 1997 *Variorum* volume, and announce further studies on that topic. Five articles in this volume (nos. I, III–V, XI) are partially or entirely devoted to Jews who, admittedly, were a marginal factor in the Empire and in Latin Romania. While the emphasis on this ethnic-cultural group partly derives from a personal choice, it is also justified by the fact that many relevant Jewish sources have not been exploited until now. Their examination and their confrontation with Byzantine, western and Arabic evidence reveal hitherto unknown facts and enable a better exploration of wider issues.

The studies in the present volume are largely based on published primary sources. Most of them, however, also rely on unpublished documents, which for the period preceding the fourteenth century are far more abundant than generally assumed. The Venetian and Genoese archives and the Cairo Genizah, which is the most important medieval depository of Jewish documents, are still largely unexplored and yield a large amount of information. The new reading of published evidence, in addition to its combination and confrontation with unpublished sources of variegated origin reveal misunderstood or overlooked aspects and suggest novel interpretations of the documentation. They also shed new light on various processes and general phenomena.

I wish to thank the following editors, publishers and institutions for granting permission to reproduce the studies included in this volume, which originally appeared in periodicals or collective volumes, the latter often difficult to find: the late Prof. Nikolas Oikonomides, Institute for Byzantine Research, National Hellenic Foundation, Athens (I); Prof. Laura

Balletto, editor of *Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino* (II); the Goulandri–Horn Foundation, Athens (III); Prof. G.G. Litavrin, chief editor of *Vizantijskij Vremennik* (V); the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, publisher of *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* (VI); Prof. Chryssa A. Maltezou, director of the Istituto ellenico di Studi bizantini e postbizantini di Venezia (VII); Frank Cass, publishers of *Mediterranean Historical Review* (VIII); Historisches Kolleg, Munich (IX); Prof. Gabriella Airaldi, editor of the Collana dell'Istituto di storia del medioevo e della espansione europea, Istituto di Storia del Medioevo, University of Genoa (X). Article XI is unpublished and appears here for the first time.

Some mistakes have been corrected in the text and notes of the studies reproduced below, while others as well as omissions and additions are listed in the *Addenda et corrigenda* preceding the index at the end of this volume.

DAVID JACOBY

The Hebrew University, Jerusalem

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

The articles in this volume, as in all others in the Variorum Collected Studies Series, have not been given a new, continuous pagination. In order to avoid confusion, and to facilitate their use where these same studies have been referred to elsewhere, the original pagination has been maintained wherever possible.

Each article has been given a Roman number in order of appearance, as listed in the Contents. This number is repeated on each page and is quoted in the index entries.

Corrections noted in the Addenda and Corrigenda have been marked by an asterisk in the margin corresponding to the relevant text to be amended.

WHAT DO WE LEARN ABOUT BYZANTINE ASIA MINOR FROM THE DOCUMENTS OF THE CAIRO GENIZAH?

The so-called Cairo Genizah requires a short presentation. According to Jewish custom, writings containing the name of God should not be destroyed or discarded, but orderly buried or stored. The Genizah was the repository of such material in a room attached to a synagogue in Fustat or Old Cairo. Discovered in the late nineteenth century, it has yielded pieces ranging from small fragments of parchment or paper to entire books and from private letters and commercial documents to liturgical texts and literary works, totalling more than 250,000 leaves, which include about 10,000 documents of some length mostly from the eleventh to the thirteenth century. The Genizah sources have been widely exploited for the reconstruction of Jewish social, economic, intellectual and religious life, especially in Egypt¹. They are written in Hebrew or Arabic, a small number being in Greek, and often present a mixture of languages. However, regardless of their nature and the languages used, the Genizah texts with few exceptions only have one feature in common: they are in Hebrew script². The languages and script used, as well as the fact that most of them have neither been published nor translated explains why they have been virtually overlooked in Byzantine studies dealing with topics other than the Empire's Jews.

Among the known Genizah texts some have been written by Greek-speaking Jews living in the Empire or beyond its borders, while others refer to members of these two groups. Several of them are interspersed with Greek words, phrases and sentences. The precise dating and origin of these documents cannot always be determined, yet many of them belong to the eleventh or

1. See S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Berkeley – Los Angeles, 1967-1993, 5 vols. and index vol.; on the Genizah itself, see *ibid.*, I, 1-28.

2. One may wonder how a fragment apparently containing Christian hymns in minuscule Greek hand found its way to the Genizah (Cambridge, University Library, Taylor-Schechter Collection, K24.270), unless in possession of a Jew preparing for a theological disputation with Christians: briefly mentioned in N. R. M. De Lange. "Two Genizah Fragments in Hebrew and Greek", in J. A. Emerton – S. C. Reif (eds.), *Interpreting the Hebrew Bible. Essays in Honour of E. J. J. Rosenthal*, Cambridge 1982, 61.

twelfth century³. They offer precious, though scattered and fragmentary evidence about the Empire itself and, as implied by their preservation in Old Cairo, provide a particular insight into the Empire's relations with Egypt. In view of its geographic position, Byzantine Asia Minor was necessarily involved in these relations, whether directly or indirectly. The aim of this paper is to illustrate the value and implications of some Genizah sources for the evolution of Asia Minor from the late tenth to the mid-twelfth century, once they are inserted within their proper context.

The earliest Genizah source examined here is a *kettubah* or Jewish marriage document drafted in 1022 at Mastaura, a small town located on a tributary of the Maeander river in Lydia⁴. It contains interesting economic, social and cultural data, and is a noteworthy addition to the small number of roughly contemporary and especially later Byzantine documents listing dowry items, wedding gifts and household equipment⁵. The mother of the bride, obviously a widow, granted her daughter the lower storey of the family house and half the ownership of its well, which the bride and her brother were to share. No other real estate is mentioned. The movable objects belonging or offered to the bride included pieces of kitchenware, jewelry, clothing, belts, as well as bathing articles⁶. As usual each item was evaluated in common currency, except for some pieces of jewelry mentioned by weight⁷. The *mohar* or obligatory marriage gift, which according to Jewish law the bridegroom undertook to make to the bride, amounted to 8 1/2 gold *dinars* only, the strict minimum according to 'Jerusalem' custom⁸. The bridegroom added a voluntary marriage gift that in our case may be estimated at 6 *nomismata* or gold coins⁹. The total obtained from the addition

3. A collection of such sources has recently been edited by N. De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 51), Tübingen 1996. It includes a Greek translation of *Ecclesiastes* in Hebrew script (no. 9).

4. New ed. and trans., *ibid.*, 1-10.

5. For which see N. Oikonomides, "The Contents of the Byzantine House from the Eleventh to the Fifteenth Century", *DOP* 44 (1990), 205-214; G. Weiss, "Vermögensbildung der Byzantiner in Privathand: Methodische Fragen einer quantitativen Analyse", *Βυζαντινά* 11 (1982), 88-92. Many such Jewish documents mainly bearing on Egypt have been found in the Genizah: see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, esp. III, 363-422, and IV, 314-344.

6. The translation by De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah*, 4, l. 21, should be slightly emended as follows: "a woman's dress and a bag for the bath". It would seem, therefore, that all the three items listed, including the small *mesalin*, translated as 'tablecloth', were bathing articles.

7. They probably accounted for somewhat more than two *nomismata*, considering that two armbands weighing 18 shekels were worth 2 gold pieces: *ibid.*, 7, ll. 26-27.

8. See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, III, 118-123, and M. A. Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine. A Cairo Genizah Study*, Tel Aviv - New York 1980-1981, I, 238-262. On the implications of the evaluation of the *mohar* in *dinars*, see below.

9. On this payment, see Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine*, I, 267-271.

of all the individual items was 35 1/3 *nomismata*, rather a small sum¹⁰. The Jewish marriage deed of Mastaura thus gives us a rare insight into the modest economic standing of two urban households living in a small inland city of western Asia Minor. Their condition contrasted sharply with that of a prosperous Jewish physician from Egypt settled in the port of Seleucia about a century later, whose fortune will be examined below.

Some pieces of clothing listed in the marriage document of 1022 are of particular interest, since they must have been considered luxury items in the bride's and bridegroom's social milieu, despite their fairly low value. The kerchiefs worth 2 *nomismata* each seem to have been similar to the Rumi or Byzantine *mandil* frequently appearing among dowry items of Jewish brides listed in Genizah documents from the tenth to the twelfth century. The price of these kerchiefs widely varied according to the yarn used, the quality of their weaving and their designs¹¹. Many of the expensive silk kerchiefs recorded in Egypt were presumably imported from the Empire, while cheaper ones were apparently local imitations; in addition, kerchiefs made of linen were produced in Tinnis¹². It is unclear which material was used for those of Mastaura, although silk seems most likely. Indeed, there is good reason to believe that sericulture was being practiced on a large scale in western Asia Minor at that time, although extant sources attest it for a somewhat later period¹³. Moreover, the *μανδήλια* mentioned in our document were more expensive than another piece of silk clothing worth 1 1/2 *nomisma*, which the mother gave to the bride. The 'double red *koukoularikon* garment' was made of a low-grade silk fabric, woven with the short fibers of waste and floss silk spun into a yarn of a rough and uneven quality. The testimony offered by our marriage deed in this respect is a valuable addition to the otherwise poorly documented use of the *koukoulariko* silk cloth, which seems to have been increasingly in demand in the Empire since the early

10. This total is reached only if we assume that each of the dresses mentioned in De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah*, 5, ll. 18-19, was worth 1 *nomisma*, and each of the two additional kerchiefs on l. 20, two *nomismata*, to which the value of the jewelry items mentioned above should be added.

11. For the latter, see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 46; IV, 167, 191, 315, 320, 329-330. Goitein wrongly assumed that Arabic *mandil* derived from a Latin root, like Spanish *mantilla*, and that Rumi *mandil* was a western product or a replica of it. He was not aware that the Arabic word came from Greek *μανδήλιον* and that Rumi applied in this case to a genuinely Byzantine or an imitation of a Byzantine kerchief. On the use of the term Rum, see below, p. 93.

12. For the latter, see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, IV, 167, 191.

13. This evidence will be presented in my study on the Byzantine silk industry, in progress.

eleventh century, like half-silks combining silk with cotton¹⁴. The red silk dress apparently had a cotton lining¹⁵, like some cotton garments with linen, a feature known from the tenth century Ἑπαρχικὸν Βιβλίον or *Book of the Prefect* that would further emphasize the modest value of this dowry item.

The Jewish marriage deed of 1022 provides some indirect evidence about earlier population movements. Its formula follows a model common in Iraq at that time, yet the evaluation of the minimum *mohar* or compulsory marriage gift in gold *dinars*, to the amount of 8 1/2 units, as well as the Greek word *aqolytos* at the end of the operative section of the contract reflect Jewish custom in Palestine¹⁶. Despite the hybrid nature of the document, there is good reason to believe that the ancestors of the Jews living at Mastaura in the early eleventh century, or some of them at least, had come from Palestine or Syria. However, by 1022 the families of the bride and the bridegroom, as well as those of the witnesses appear to have been fully immersed in their Greek milieu. This is already conveyed by some of their names. Byzantine Jews used either Hebrew or Greek names and sometimes both concurrently. Most names mentioned in our document are Hebrew, although one of them, Namer, appears to be the equivalent of a Greek name, Pardoleon¹⁷. On the other hand, the bride and the father of one of the witnesses bore common Greek names, Evdokia and Leon respectively. Another noteworthy feature is the language of the marriage contract, obviously familiar to all those present at the ceremony. In addition to

14. See D. Jacoby, "Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade", *BZ* 84/85 (1991-1992), 474-475, 496 and n. 254, repr. in idem, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, Hampshire 1997, no. VII.

15. De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah*, p. 6, line 30, translates 'double-faced red dress of silk', and explains it, 5, commentary to l. 18, as made of a cloth with a double-faced weave having two different patterns, one above the other. This is rather unlikely, in view of the complexity of the weaving process involved, which contrasts with the low cost of the garment. A lined garment appears more likely. For the lining of cotton garments with linen, see J. Koder (ed.), *Das Eparchenbuch Leons des Weisen* (CFHB, XXXIII), Wien 1991, chap. 9, par. 1. A similar lining may be assumed for silks.

16. The version 'aqolytos' is preferable to 'aqolutos', adopted by De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah*, 9, l. 10. The debate about this term is summarized by Friedman, *Jewish Marriage in Palestine*, I, 479-480 and n. 123, and by De Lange, *ibid.*, 8, commentary to l. 10. The possible meanings are 'in good order', 'without impediment', 'no objection', 'unhindered'. The use of this Greek term must clearly go back to the period preceding the seventh-century Muslim conquest of Palestine.

17. As suggested by S. B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204-1453*, University of Alabama, 1985, 249, n. 4, who adduces further examples of 'Namer' among Greek-speaking Jews; for Greeks, see E. Trapp, *Prosopographisches Lexikon der Palaiologenzeit*, Vienna 1976-1996, I/9, nos. 21,918-21,920, s. v. Παρδολέων.

a mixture of Hebrew and Aramaic, common to Jewish marriage documents, the deed contains more than a dozen Greek words for movable objects, even when Hebrew words were available¹⁸. While some of the Greek words are attested elsewhere, others appear exclusively in our document and may well reflect a specific regional vocabulary. Whatever the case, their phonetic Hebrew transcription offers a faithful rendition of their pronunciation in western Asia Minor in the early eleventh century¹⁹.

Both the Greek names and words appearing in the document of Mastaura illustrate a process of acculturation extending over many years. It would seem that the forefathers of those present at the marriage of 1022 had been established in Byzantine Asia Minor for two or three generations, yet presumably not more. This would explain why they still retained the evaluation of the compulsory marriage gift in *dinars*, whereas other marriage deeds of Byzantine Jews refer to *zehubim kostantini* or 'Constantinopolitan gold coins'²⁰. In any event, two or three generations before 1022 bring us back to the second half of the tenth century. This period witnessed a large-scale migration from Syria into Asia Minor in the wake of the Byzantine conquests of the 960s and 970s by Nicephorus II Phocas and John I Tzimiskes. The population movement was enhanced by religious persecutions in Fatimid territories in the early eleventh century, during the reign of the Egyptian caliph al-Hakim, unstable conditions in Syria and Palestine, and the prospects of security and economic expansion in the Empire. In addition to large numbers of Syrians and Armenians, Jewish immigrants from Muslim countries settled then in Asia Minor, as suggested by our marriage deed and various other Genizah documents²¹.

One of these is a letter of 1028, almost contemporary with the marriage deed of Mastaura. It reveals the arrival of Jewish immigrants from Muslim countries and their settlement in Attaleia within the preceding decades, and the existence of a stable and well organized Jewish community in that city, with elders at its head. The letter mentions four Rabbanites and three Karaites

18. Translation and notes in De Lange, as above, n. 4, yet see my reservations above, n. 6, 15.

19. Hebrew uses consonants only, although some of these acquired over time the value of vowels. Nevertheless, scribes added points serving as vowels to most Greek words in order to ensure their correct reading.

20. Text of such a model in A. Gulak, *Otsar ha-shetaroth ha-nehugim be-Yisrael*, Jerusalem 1926, 35-36 [Hebrew]. Another model is preserved in Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, heb. 188, f. 132 v., a manuscript in Byzantine Hebrew hand dated 1432-1433. It obviously reflects earlier practice.

21. See D. Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland", in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*, Aldershot, Hampshire 1995, 223-225.

among seven Jewish merchants from Attaleia captured by Muslim pirates²². The Rabbanites belonged to the mainstream of Judaism relying on Rabbinic oral law as exposed in the Talmud, while the Karaites rejected it and advocated the literal exegesis of the Hebrew Bible. The Karaites first established their own congregations in the Arabic-speaking Muslim East. The one existing in Attaleia in 1028 is the first to be directly documented in the Empire²³, yet from other Genizah evidence it appears that some Karaite Jews were already established in Constantinople around the year 1000. It may be assumed that several of them, like Syrians and Armenians, had first settled for some time in Asia Minor before proceeding to the Empire's capital²⁴.

A further large-scale migration occurred in the wake of the Seljuks' victory at Mantzikert in 1071 and their expansion in Asia Minor²⁵. A letter written by a Jewish scholar around 1089 offers a personal testimony reflecting the general political climate that prompted this movement. The author of the letter first emigrated from his native Old Cairo around 1064. After staying for some time in Jerusalem, as well as at various places in Syria, he crossed with his family into Byzantine Asia Minor, yet does not specify where he settled. In or shortly after 1071 he fled westward and eventually reached Thessalonica²⁶. However, not all Jews fleeing the Seldjucs proceeded to territories remaining under Byzantine rule. Some of them sought refuge in Fatimid territory, a rather unlikely alternative for Greeks, Syrians or Armenians. Various Genizah sources refer to refugees from the Empire obtaining financial assistance from the Jewish community of Alexandria. A cantor is attested in that city around 1075, thus shortly after the battle of Mantzikert. Some fifty Byzantine Jews, many with dependents, are registered as aid recipients in 1107, and others sometime between 1100

22. A. Cowley (ed.), "Bodleian Genizah Fragments, IV", *Jewish Quarterly Review* 19 (1906), 251-254; partial trans. by J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641-1204* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechischen Philologie, 30), Athens 1939, 190-191, no. 132.

23. See Z. Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium. The Formative Years, 970-1100*, New York - Jerusalem 1959, 46-49.

24. See above, n. 21.

25. On the background, see Sp. Vryonis Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* Berkeley 1971, 110-194; idem, "Patterns of Population Movement in Byzantine Asia Minor, 1071-1261", *XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines (Athènes 1976), Rapports et co-rapports*, I/2, Athens 1976, 1-10.

26. Ed. by S. D. Goitein, "The Jewish Communities of Saloniki and Thebes in Ancient Documents from the Cairo Geniza", *Sefunot, Annual for Research on the Jewish Communities in the East* 11 (1971-1977), 11-22 [Hebrew, with English summary]; trans. and commentary by Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, V, 438-443, yet see also Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople", 226-227, 231.

and 1140²⁷. We do not know when they left the Empire. Among them we find dyers, tailors, cobblers, goldsmiths and scribes. The precise origin of these Byzantine Jews is stated in few cases only. One of them is registered as hailing from Asia Minor, while another came from Melitene, an important crossroad in eastern Cappadocia on the way to Iraq captured by the Seljuks in 1071²⁸. It is likely that several other refugees listed as Rum also emigrated from Asia Minor.

Whether directly or indirectly, the Genizah sources, including those examined so far, provide some useful evidence, not found elsewhere, regarding the role of Asia Minor in Mediterranean trade and shipping. Since the late tenth century unstable conditions in the region of the Persian Gulf generated a shift in the westward trade route followed by Asian spices, perfumes and colorants. Instead of proceeding through Iran and Iraq toward Trebizond, they increasingly crossed the Red Sea and reached Alexandria, which became the main western outlet of these oriental goods²⁹. In turn this shift stimulated commercial exchanges between Fatimid Egypt and the Empire. The differing and complementary nature of the economies of these two states called for trade in a broad range of wares, in addition to luxury items. The maritime route linking their main emporia steadily gained in importance, to the benefit of ports located along the southern and western seaboard of Asia Minor. These ports served as outlets for commodities of their own hinterland and neighboring islands, and at the same time offered logistical support to ships and merchants in transit. It may be assumed, therefore, that in the late tenth and in the eleventh century many Jewish and other immigrants arriving from Muslim territories were attracted by the expanding economies of these ports. Genizah letters, some dated and others datable within a decade or so, illustrate these developments.

In the first half of the eleventh century shipping and trade along the coast of Asia Minor were adversely affected by several factors. In 1016 Emperor Basil II decreed a ban on trade with and travel to Muslim countries, from which only

27. See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 51, 54, 56-57; II, 443, nos. 19-23, 447, no. 32. The lists of recipients can only be dated approximately. It is unlikely that the Rum mentioned in them were 'European' Jews fleeing the lands captured by the crusaders, as suggested by Goitein, *ibid.*, II, 127, 130, 442, no. 17, and 443, no. 23. Note that several lists, including an earlier one from the years 1040-1060 referred to *ibid.*, II, 441, no. 8, mention the precise origin of individuals from cities under Muslim rule, yet register separately the Rum.

28. *Ibid.*, II, 447, no. 32.

29. On Trebizond and its trade routes in the late ninth and in the tenth century, see R. S. Lopez, "Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire", *Speculum* 20 (1945), p. 29 and 30, n. 1, repr. in *idem*, *Byzantium and the World around it: Economic and Institutional Relations*, London 1978, no. III; Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor*, 15-20; on the shift in favor of Egypt, see J.-C. Garcin, "Transport des épices et espace égyptien entre le XIe et le XVe siècle", *Annales de Bretagne et des pays de l'Ouest* 85 (1978), 305-309.

Aleppo was excluded. This ban lasted until 1027, when Emperor Constantine VIII concluded an agreement with the Fatimid caliph al-Zahir³⁰. Yet one may wonder whether anyhow it had been very effective, judging by some Genizah letters that will soon be adduced. Far more troublesome were naval warfare between Byzantine and Muslim forces and especially piracy, an unavoidable corollary of commercial shipping³¹. A landing carried out by Muslim pirates in Lycia in 1034 resulted in their temporary seizure of Myra, the famous pilgrimage center situated at some distance from the coast³². About that time a Genizah letter reports the capture of five Jewish youths from Strobilos, a port to the west of Bodrum³³. It is unlikely that these youths were merchants sailing on business and we may surmise, therefore, that they were seized on land in the same Muslim raid or a similar one³⁴. It is noteworthy that Strobilos appears in connection with a measure taken by the Byzantine authorities to prevent similar operations. In 1035 a number of Muslims captured after the defeat of their fleet in the battle of the Cyclades were impaled on the shore or drowned along the coast extending from Adramyttion to Strobilos, apparently a region witnessing intensive maritime traffic and, therefore, particularly affected by piratical attacks³⁵.

30. On the ban, see G. Schlumberger, *L'épopée byzantine à la fin du dixième siècle*, Paris 1896-1905, II, 452-454, and III, 23; W. Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt im früheren 11. Jahrhundert. Geschichte der politischen Beziehungen von 1001 bis 1055*, Vienna 1981, 68, 80-81, whose dating is more precise.

31. On Muslim piracy in that period, see H. Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe-XVe siècles*, Paris 1966, 130-134.

32. Ibid., *Byzance et la mer*, 134; for the date, see Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt im früheren 11. Jahrhundert*, 203.

33. Ed. by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 245, and see 186, no. 128, commentary, yet the correct reading of the Hebrew place name is ASTSVILO, which more or less reflects the medieval Greek pronunciation. On the location of Strobilos and its Jews, see C. Foss, "Strobilos and Related Sites", *AnSt* 38 (1988), 147-159, 164-168, repr. in idem, *History and Archaeology of Byzantine Asia Minor*, London 1990, no. XII.

34. Later evidence about the Jews of Strobilos appears in a chrysobull of 1153 issued by Emperor Manuel I in favor of the church of Hagia Sophia in Constantinople, cited by Theodore Balsamon; regardless of their residence, the Jews of Strobilos were liable to a tax: K. Rhalles - M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, Athens 1852-1859, II, 605-608; J. and P. Zepos, *Jus graecoromanum*, Athens 1931, I, 380; trans. of the passage in Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 228, no. 181. Dating in F. Dölger, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches von 565-1453*, II, 2nd ed., Munich 1994, no. 1390.

35. See W. Felix, *Byzanz und die islamische Welt im früheren 11. Jahrhundert*, 203-204; see also above, n. 31. On the fate of the Muslims, see E. Eickhoff, *Seekrieg und Seepolitik zwischen Islam und Abendland*, Berlin 1966, 384; the stretch of coast chosen contradicts this author's assumption that the raids may have been directed toward Thrace.

Three other Genizah letters, one of which has already been mentioned, illustrate piracy and maritime trade somewhat to the east of that region between 1020 and 1035. Each of them deals with a particular group of Jewish merchants from Attaleia ransomed and freed in Egypt, after being captured and robbed of their money and goods by Muslim pirates³⁶. The original destination of these merchants is not stated. It is obvious, though, that Greek and other merchants from Attaleia and additional ports of southern Asia Minor were engaging in similar ventures. In any event, these and other Genizah letters attest to the importance of Attaleia as a commercial center in that period³⁷. Muslim pirates pursued their activity in Byzantine waters in the second half of the eleventh century³⁸. Some of them repeatedly sailed along the coast of Asia Minor, as explicitly mentioned in a Genizah letter written between 1065 and 1080³⁹. Yet Byzantine pirates too operated in the vicinity of Asia Minor in the eleventh century. A Genizah letter written around 1050 records that a ship apparently from the southern Italian city of Amalfi was prevented from sailing westward through the Aegean and pursued by a Byzantine vessel almost as far as Constantinople⁴⁰. Somewhat later three Jewish merchants from Egypt captured by Byzantine pirates were brought by Amalfitan merchants from an undisclosed place to Alexandria and freed there in return for a ransom⁴¹. In short, these sources imply a lively commercial and maritime activity in which the ports of western

36. Ed. J. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and in Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs*, Oxford 1920, II, 87, no. 12, and 91, no. 16, summarized in I, 90 and 92, respectively; partial trans. in Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 186, no. 128, and 191, no. 133.

37. On Attaleia in the late tenth and early eleventh century, see C. Foss, "The Cities of Pamphylia in the Byzantine Age", 8-10, in idem, *Cities, Fortresses and Villages of Byzantine Asia Minor*, Aldershot, Hampshire 1996, no. IV. The Jewish community of Attaleia is again attested in 1148, when it was involved in a lawsuit: see Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 219, 221-222, nos. 167, 171; E. Patlagean, "Contribution juridique à l'histoire des Juifs dans la Méditerranée médiévale: les formules grecques de serment", *Revue des études juives*, 4e série, 4 (1965), 143-146, repr. in eadem, *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance*, London 1981, no. XI.

38. Contrary to Ahrweiler, *Byzance et la mer*, 163, 165, 169, 171.

39. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt*, II, 363-365, dating in I, 207; partial trans. by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 201, no. 148.

40. S. D. Goitein (trans.), *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*, Princeton 1973, 44-45, no. 5, and see D. Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa", in L. Balletto (ed.), *Oriente e Occidente fra medioevo ed età moderna. Studi in onore di Geo Pistarino*, Genoa 1997, 523-524.

41. See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 329 and 484, n. 14. The letter reporting the case was addressed to Nahray b. Nissim, a prominent merchant banker active in Egypt between 1049 and 1097: see M. R. Cohen, *Jewish Self-Government in Medieval Egypt. The Origins of the Office of Head of the Jews, ca. 1065-1126*, Princeton, N. J. 1980, 102-104.

and southern Asia Minor participated, either as destinations or as transit stations.

This traffic is further reflected throughout the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth century by the constant two-way movement of Jews and Jewish letters between Fatimid Egypt and Jerusalem on the one hand, the Empire and particularly Constantinople, on the other⁴². The author of the letter of 1089 who eventually settled in Thessalonica, mentioned earlier⁴³, may have crossed the land border between Muslim and Byzantine territories, yet most Jews travelling from Egypt or Palestine to the Empire or in the opposite direction must have depended on maritime transportation along the coast of Asia Minor. Similarly, letters exchanged between these regions were mostly conveyed by ship. Thus, for instance, between 1092 and August 1096 an Egyptian Jew recently settled in Constantinople entrusted a letter addressed to his brother, who had remained in Old Cairo, to an Amalfitan merchant about to sail to Egypt⁴⁴.

Some eleventh and twelfth century Genizah letters illustrate directly or indirectly the function of Asia Minor in the commercial exchanges between Egypt and the Empire. Asia Minor itself shipped some of its cheese to Alexandria⁴⁵, as well as medicinal plants and drugs⁴⁶. In 1137 a Jewish physician from Egypt settled in Seleucia refers in a letter written in Arabic to the earlier dispatch of precious drugs to his native country and orders seeds of medical herbs not available in Asia Minor⁴⁷. Chios sent to Egypt its mastic, used in the manufacturing of perfumes and in pastries, as attested in 1050 and in the second half of the eleventh century⁴⁸. Trade in these commodities clearly implies commerce in a much broader range of goods passing through the ports of Asia Minor. The Genizah letters also document the presence of Byzantine merchants in Egypt. One of these letters sent from Alexandria to Old Cairo in the 1060s or

42. Some further examples in Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople", 224-226.

43. See above, p. 88.

44. Ed. J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, Cincinnati - Philadelphia 1931-1935, I, 48-51, and see II, 1458; partial trans. and discussion in Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 182-184, no. 125. For the dating of the letter and the location of its writer, see D. Jacoby, "The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Komnenian to the Palaeologan Period", *VizVrem* 55/2 (1998), 31-40.

45. See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 46, 124.

46. *Ibid.*, I, 402, n. 35.

47. Ed. and Hebrew trans. by S. D. Goitein, "A Letter of Historical Importance from Seleucia (Selefké), Cilicia, dated 21 July 1137", *Tarbiš* 27 (1958), 528-535; English trans. and commentary by idem, "A Letter from Seleucia (Cilicia), dated 21 July 1137", *Speculum* 39 (1964), 298-303, and for the information mentioned here, 299, 301.

48. See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 268 and 154, and for the dating of the second letter, 153.

early 1070s refers “to the merchants from Constantinople [who] have already agreed upon prices”⁴⁹. Genizah documents often apply the term *Rum* to both Byzantines and Latins⁵⁰, like Arabic-speaking geographers and travellers as late as the second half of the twelfth century⁵¹. In many instances, however, circumstantial evidence enables us to determine the precise identity of the merchants and ships involved. Such is the case with a letter of the late eleventh century sent from Alexandria to Old Cairo, which contains precious information about wares: “Please take notice that no pepper, cinnamon or ginger are available in Alexandria. If you have any of these commodities, keep them, for the Rum are keen solely on them. All the Rum are about to leave for Old Cairo. They are only waiting for the arrival of two additional ships from Constantinople”⁵². It follows that Byzantine merchants were then exporting oriental commodities from Egypt to the imperial capital, obviously via the ports of Asia Minor.

Most merchants, travellers and emigrants mentioned so far sailed between the Empire and Egypt either on board Byzantine or Muslim ships. No attention has been paid, however, to the eleventh century participation of Amalfitan merchants in maritime traffic along this itinerary. At first the Amalfitans traded separately with the Empire and with Egypt. They are attested in Constantinople since 944 and in Cairo since 976, although they presumably began to trade earlier in both cities⁵³. They progressively extended the geographic range of their commerce and shipping along the coasts of the eastern Mediterranean. In Tripoli, Syria, the Persian traveller Nasir-i Khusrau noted in 1047 Rum ships from the West, which most likely were Amalfitan vessels⁵⁴. This assumption is enhanced by Genizah letters. As noted earlier, one of them dated to around the mid-eleventh century records the voyage of an apparently Amalfitan ship that sailed from Alexandria along the Levantine coast on its way to Amalfi, while another refers to Amalfitan merchants bringing Jewish captives to Alexandria

49. Ibid., IV, 168.

50. Ibid., I, 43.

51. For instance, in the 1180s Ibn Jubayr refers both to the Rum of Constantinople and to the Genoese Rumi captain of a ship on which he sailed: R. J. C. Broadhurst (trans.), *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, London 1951, 267, 327.

52. Quoted by Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 44.

53. See M. Balard, “Amalfi et Byzance (Xe-XIe siècles)”, *TM* 6 (1976), 87-92; P. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale. Études sur l'évolution des structures urbaines*, Paris 1996, 85-88; D. Jacoby, “Les Italiens en Égypte aux XIe et XIIe siècles: du comptoir à la colonie?”, in M. Balard – A. Ducellier (eds.), *Coloniser au Moyen Âge*, Paris 1995, 76-77.

54. Nâsir-i Khusrau, *Sefernâme*, ed. and French trans. Ch. Schefer, *Relation du voyage de Nassiri Khosrau en Syrie, en Palestine, en Égypte, en Arabie et en Perse pendant les années de l'hégire 437-444 (1035-1042)*, Paris 1881, 41, 113; Naser-e Khosraw, *Book of Travels (Safarnama)*, English trans. W. M. Thackson, Jr., Albany, N. Y. 1986, 13.

somewhat later, whether from Constantinople or from a port along the waterway joining both cities. The imminent departure of an Amalfitan from the Byzantine capital for Egypt in the 1090s, on what appears to be a routine voyage, further implies that by the second half of the eleventh century the Amalfitans were not only sailing regularly between Amalfi and Constantinople or Alexandria, but also between these two cities⁵⁵. In fact, cumulatively they had established a triangular trade and shipping pattern within the Eastern Mediterranean, in the framework of which the ports of Byzantine Asia Minor served as transit stations. This is also suggested by the hospice for pilgrims which Amalfitan merchants established in Byzantine Antioch, presumably in the 1070s⁵⁶. In the late eleventh century Venetian merchants similarly extended their activity along the maritime route linking Constantinople and Egypt. Indeed, the chrysobull granted by Alexios I Komnenos to Venice in 1082 suggests that Venetian traders and ships had expanded their operations beyond the western provinces of the Empire and Constantinople and were reaching Antioch, as well as the Syrian port of Laodikeia or Lattakia under Muslim rule⁵⁷. On the other hand, the merchants from Bari who in 1087 seized the remains of St. Nicholas preserved at Myra do not appear to have traded along the coast of Asia Minor beyond Lycia⁵⁸.

The First Crusade created turmoil in Asia Minor for a short period. Soon afterwards, however, the establishment of the Latin states in the Levant resulted in the consolidation of the triangular trade and shipping pattern joining Italy with the Empire and Egypt. Within this pattern there was a progressive rise in maritime trade between the two countries, as well as between the West, the crusader Levant and Egypt. The two networks converged along the southern shore of Asia Minor, to the benefit of the ports of this region⁵⁹. Indirect evi-

55. See above, 91-92.

56. On Amalfitan trade in the Levant and pilgrimage to Jerusalem, see Figliuolo, "Amalfi e il Levante", 581-593, 609-611, and on the hospice in Antioch, R. Hiestand, "Die Anfänge der Johanniter", in J. Fleckenstein – M. Hellmann (eds.), *Die geistlichen Ritterorden Europas* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 26), Sigmaringen 1980, 33-37.

57. G. L. Fr. Tafel – G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Wien 1856-1857, I, 51-54, and new ed. by M. Pozza – G. Ravagnani (eds.), *I trattati con Bisanzio, 992-1198* (Pacta veneta, 4), Venice 1993, 35-45; see D. Jacoby, "Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: A Reconsideration", *Anuario de estudios medievales* 24 (1994), 352, repr. in idem, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping*, no. II.

58. On their operation, see C. Foss, "The Lycian Coast in the Byzantine Age", *DOP* 48 (1994), 34-35, repr. in idem, *Cities, Fortresses and Villages of Byzantine Asia Minor*, no. II.

59. On maritime routes between Italy and Egypt, see J. H. Pryor, *Geography, Technology and War. Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean, 649-1571*, Cambridge 1988, 94-97, yet see my reservations about the role of Crete in Jacoby, "Byzantine Crete", above, n. 40.

dence in this respect is found in the letter of 1137, noted earlier, which a Jewish physician from Egypt settled in Seleucia sent to his relatives who had remained in his native land⁶⁰. The writer was frankly optimistic about economic prospects in the Empire. He mentions by name eleven other Egyptian Jews who either had settled in Seleucia or in Constantinople and urged his in-laws to join him. The physician had apparently arrived some twelve years earlier in Seleucia, married a local Jewish woman, and rapidly prospered. He had built a house worth 200 gold coins. In addition to his medical practice he was engaging in trade. He had in store 400 barrels of wine prepared according to rabbinical prescriptions and, therefore, fit for Jewish consumption. Much of this wine was presumably intended for export to other Jewish communities. To his son-in-law the physician had provided a marriage gift consisting of 324 gold coins, a pound of silver, one brocade and two silk robes, a bed with a canopy, as well as other valuable objects, the total value of which amounted to some 200 gold coins. He complained that dowries were far more expensive in Asia Minor than in Egypt. Yet his gifts were rather small compared with those a high-ranking Byzantine official such as Michael Psellos had offered to the future husband of his adoptive daughter about a century earlier, in 1053. These gifts amounted to 3,600 *nomismata*, including 2,160 in cash⁶¹.

The few Genizah sources we have examined offer some new insights into migration, settlement, daily life, the common language and the economy in Byzantine Asia Minor, as well as into trade and shipping along its coast in the eleventh and first half of the twelfth century. These sources are especially valuable for the reconstruction of economic relations between the Empire and Egypt, although most of them fail to provide any data about commodities, volume or prices. A comprehensive list of Genizah material bearing on Byzantium is highly desirable. Once it has been established, more information about the Empire will become available, including about Asia Minor.

60. See Goitein, "A Letter from Seleucia (Cilicia)", 298-303, esp. 299-300.

61. G. Weiss, *Oströmische Beamte im Spiegel der Schriften des Michael Psellos*, Munich 1973, 130. On other data, see above, n. 5.

Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa

It is commonly believed that throughout the Middle Ages Crete occupied a strategic location at the crossing of the major maritime lanes of the Mediterranean and was one of the keys to sea power and the control of navigation in the region. The island, therefore, was of particular importance in the late eleventh and the twelfth century, a period witnessing a substantial expansion of western sea-borne trade in the Eastern Mediterranean¹. This proposition, largely based on evidence from the twelfth century onwards, may be questioned. To be sure, cyclic natural conditions such as winds, as well as the configuration of coastlines, offshore dangers and havens determined the seasonal pattern and the basic long-term network of navigation and trade in the Mediterranean. Yet the course of maritime routes was far from constant. Economic interests and favorable trading conditions prompted merchants to shift their activity from one area to another or to expand into new areas. Conversely, secu-

¹ See F. THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII^e-XV^e siècles)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 193, Paris, 1959, p. 124; J.H. PRYOR, *Geography, Technology and War. Studies in the Maritime History of the Mediterranean, 649-1571*, Cambridge, 1988, esp. pp. 7-8, 24, 70-71, 94-95; E. MALAMUT, *Les îles de l'Empire byzantin, VII^e-XII^e siècles*, Paris, 1988, esp. pp. 171-175, 438-446, 546-561, and maps on pp. 652-653, 656-663; S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici*, Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, Miscellanea di studi e memorie, 26, Venezia, 1988, p. 20. Crete's role in the framework of maritime trade in this period has been overlooked by D. TSOUGARAKIS, *Byzantine Crete From the 5th Century to the Venetian Conquest*, Athens, 1988, except for some brief remarks about Italian interests in the island, pp. 289-290. The views presented below differ from those of previous authors.

rity risks deriving from adverse political circumstances and from the activity of corsairs and pirates resulted in the deflection of navigation routes from their previous course. All these factors evolved over time and were occasionally subject to sudden changes².

The interplay between them is illustrated by the function of Byzantine Crete on the west-east axis of trans-Mediterranean navigation and trade from the eleventh to the early thirteenth century, when the island was conquered by Venice. Only gradually was Crete integrated in that period within the shipping and commercial networks of Venice and Genoa, the two western maritime powers displaying interest in the island. The present study attempts to reconstruct the successive stages of this process and to determine the factors that promoted it. It is dedicated to Geo Pistarino, a dear friend and colleague, who by his sustained interest in the wide expanses of the Mediterranean has enriched our understanding of this sea's history.

* * *

By the ninth century Venice was already conducting fairly regular trade with both Byzantium or Romania and the Islamic Levant³. At first this trade was essentially limited to the shipping of goods between Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean. Since the eleventh century, however, if not earlier, Venetian merchants and ship operators took increasingly advantage of economic opportunities along their sailing routes and conveyed agricultural, pastoral and industrial commodities, as well as raw materials between ports of call within the Eastern Mediterranean itself, as between the Byzantine provinces and Constantinople⁴. Venetian ships bound for this city hugged the coast much of the way, while those sailing to Alexandria

² See J.H. PRYOR cit., esp. pp. 12-24, 38-39. On the permanence of wind systems through the centuries, see W.M. MURRAY, *Do Modern Winds Equal Ancient Winds?*, in «Mediterranean Historical Review», 2, 1987, pp. 139-167.

³ See G. ORTALLI, *Il mercante e lo stato: strutture della Venezia altomedievale*, in «Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea», Settimane di studio del centro italiano sull'alto medioevo, 40, Spoleto, 1993, pp. 95-107, 123-135.

⁴ For details, see below.

relied on a string of Aegean islands to cross over from the Peloponnese to Rhodes, from where they proceeded toward their destination. For a long period Crete was not included in their itineraries.

Economic, rather than navigational considerations appear to have been the major factor generating a change in this respect. It is appropriate, therefore, to briefly consider the evidence on Crete's economy in the period extending from the Byzantine reconquest of 961, at the expense of the Muslims, to the Venetian occupation of the island in the early thirteenth century. In view of the paucity of this evidence, it is tempting to complement it with the more abundant Venetian documentation of the thirteenth century⁵. Backward projection is always hazardous, and this appears to be especially the case with respect to the Cretan economy of the Byzantine period. Indeed, the Venetian sources of the second half of the thirteenth century suggest that growing foreign demand, an easier access of exporters to producers, and more transportation facilities stimulated an increase in Crete's production of export commodities⁶. Since all these developments belong to the Venetian era, they severely restrict the validity of later sources for the period examined here and, in any event, call for utmost circumspection in their use.

Contemporary sources, to which a Greek petition of 1224 or 1225 to the Venetian government may be added, nevertheless offer some valuable information⁷. They describe Crete as fertile and suggest that the island was basically self-sufficient. One of its riches was livestock, consisting of large herds of sheep, goats and cattle, attested for the period immediately preceding the Venetian occupation. Crete produced a surplus of cheese, which it exported in addi-

⁵ As done by D. TSOUGARAKIS cit., pp. 271-289.

⁶ See D. JACOBY, *La Venezia d'oltremare nel secondo Duecento*, in G. CRACCO-G. ORTALLI (eds.), *Storia di Venezia*, II, Roma, 1995, pp. 271-272; ID., *Cretan Cheese - a Neglected Aspect of Venetian Medieval Trade*, in «Venice: Society and Crusade. Studies * in Honor of Donald E. Queller» [in press].

⁷ Text of the petition in G. CERVELLINI (ed.), *Documento inedito veneto-cretese del Duecento*, Padova, 1906, pp. 13-18, esp. 14-16. The substantial round figures appearing in this document should not be taken at face value. The Greeks undoubtedly inflated them in order to impress upon Venice the magnitude of their losses in the preceding years. For the dating of this document, see S. BORSARI, *Il dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo*, Napoli, 1963, pp. 32-33 and esp. n. 17.

tion to wool, grain, wine, honey, as well as medicinal and aromatic herbs, yet for lack of adequate sources it is impossible to assess the volume of this trade. The island also had some mineral resources⁸. A demographic growth and an extension of cultivation apparently took place since the early eleventh century. Archeological and especially numismatic evidence suggest a ruralized society and an underdeveloped urban life, except in Chandax or Candia, the main Cretan port, exchanges in kind as well as in return for cash, and a concentration of wealth in few hands⁹. The largest landholders were the emperor, a small group of powerful local *archontes*, whose wealth is also attested by thirteenth century Venetian sources, finally, monasteries and episcopal churches¹⁰.

The great landlords either sold the island's surpluses to exporters or were themselves involved in export through their agents and employees, who like elsewhere in the Empire may have taken advantage of their functions to conduct business for their own profit. The Cretan *archontes* fulfilled an important role in the marketing of local products, as suggested by evidence bearing on their peers elsewhere in the Empire before the Fourth Crusade and in Crete proper in the

⁸ See D. TSOUGARAKIS cit., as above, n. 5; E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 385-396, 407-410, 429. Additional sources are adduced below.

⁹ D. TSOUGARAKIS cit., pp. 150-154, 265-269, 271, 300; E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 125-126, 134-136, 144-146, 155, 193-196, 262-266, 467-468, 491-494, and 514-533, *passim*. This last author's estimate of the total Cretan population about 1200, *ibid.*, pp. 125-126, is extrapolated from the figure provided for Chandax and its district by the Greek petition mentioned above, n. 7. The estimate is highly speculative, since this figure is certainly inflated and the assumption that it represents between half and one third of the island's population arbitrary.

¹⁰ D. TSOUGARAKIS cit., pp. 241-243, 247-248, 282, 291-298; E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 415-417, 421-424; J.-C. CHEYNET, *Pouvoir et contestations à Byzance (963-1210)*, Paris, 1990, pp. 238-240, 242, 409-410, 416; P. MAGDALINO, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143-1180*, Cambridge, 1993, pp. 165, 170-171, 259-260. The *archontes* apparently took advantage of the turmoil preceding the imposition of Venetian rule to expand their property by annexing land they held from the emperor, as well as imperial estates: see D. JACOBY, *Les états latins en Roumanie: phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204-1350 environ)*, in «XV^e Congrès international d'Etudes byzantines (Athènes, 1976)», Rapports et co-rapports, I/3, Athènes, 1976, pp. 4-11, repr. in ID., *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XII^e au XV^e siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies*, London, 1979, no. 1; also ID., *Social Evolution in Latin Greece*, in K. M. SETTON (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, Madison, Wisconsin, 1969-1989, VI, pp. 180-185.

Venetian period¹¹. In the late eleventh and the twelfth century the monastery of Patmos, which had estates in Crete, shipped various commodities on board the small crafts it operated in the Aegean as far as the Dardanelles and most likely also Constantinople¹². Part of this traffic went thus beyond self-supply and was of a commercial nature. A Jewish letter written in Alexandria in the 1060s or early 1070s, found in the Cairo Genizah or synagogue archive, records the presence of merchants coming from Crete¹³. These merchants presumably sailed on board Cretan or other Byzantine ships and brought Cretan products to the Egyptian port. It is likely, therefore, that they also reached Constantinople with them. Byzantine trade and shipping are unfortunately underrepresented in the extant documentation¹⁴, and this is especially the case with respect to Crete.

Commercial interests, then, rather than navigational incentives induced Venetian merchants to reach Crete. Their acquaintance with Cretan products in the Byzantine capital, elsewhere in the Empire, and in Egypt, as well as the prospects of profitable trade in them provided the main stimulus to this effect. A notarial charter of the early eleventh century possibly offers the earliest extant evidence about Venetian trade in the island. In 1022 or somewhat earlier the Venetian Leone da Molin, who appears to have travelled to Constantinople with some frequency, brought to this city six *milliaria* or at least 2,860 kg. of cheese. One half of this quantity belonged to another Venetian, who had entrusted his cheese to him under the terms of a *rogadia* contract. In the Byzantine capital Leone delivered the proceeds from the sale of the cheese belonging to the other mer-

¹¹ M.F. HENDY, 'Byzantium, 1081-1204': the Economy revisited Twenty Years on, p. 22, in ID., *The Economy, Fiscal Administration and Coinage of Byzantium*, Northampton, 1989, no. III; D. JACOBY, *Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade*, in «Byzantinische Zeitschrift», 84/85, 1991-1992, pp. 477-480; A.E. LAIOU, *Byzantine Traders and Seafarers*, in S. VRYONIS, Jr., *The Greeks and the Sea*, New Rochelle, N. Y., 1993, pp. 84-85; P. MAGDALINO cit., pp. 144, 147, 156-159, 170, n. 243; D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit.

¹² E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 414-416, 447-451.

¹³ S.D. GOITEIN, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967-1988, IV, p. 168.

¹⁴ This has again been rightly stressed by A.E. LAIOU, *Byzantine Traders* cit., pp. 79-83, 87-90, who adduces some overlooked evidence bearing on their role.

chant, who had died in the meantime¹⁵. There is no indication about the itinerary of the ship on which he travelled, nor about the provenance of the cheese. We may safely assume, though, that the latter originated in a Byzantine province located along the maritime route joining Venice to Constantinople. Twelfth century sources, examined below, point to the sale of Vlach and Cretan cheese in the Byzantine capital. At first glance it would seem more plausible that the cheese mentioned in 1022 came from Thessaly, where the inferior Vlach cheese was produced¹⁶. Crete, however, should not be excluded since the Venetians were later involved in the export of cheese from this island¹⁷. The extremely sparse documentation regarding both Crete and Venetian trade in the Eastern Mediterranean in the eleventh century prevents us from determining whether this was already the case in 1022.

Another tantalizing piece of information is contained in the letter from the Cairo Genizah dated to the 1060s or early 1070s, mentioned above. It reports that merchants from Venice and Constantinople were active alongside those from Crete in Alexandria¹⁸. Yet, surprisingly, the latter shared with the Venetians the same business approach, while differing from their Constantinopolitan counterparts who had already agreed upon prices with the local merchants. It is quite plausible, therefore, that the interests of the merchants belonging to the first two groups coincided because they exported the same Cretan agricultural and pastoral products and possibly even conducted joint business ventures. This would imply that Venetian ships were then calling in the ports of Crete on their way to other destinations. From the proceedings of a Jewish lawsuit con-

¹⁵ R. MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA - A. LOMBARDO (eds.), *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI-XIII*, Torino, 1940 [hereafter: *D. C. V.*], no. 2. In 1030 (?) Leone da Molin was in Venice and in 1031 (?) again in Constantinople, where he sold four pieces of cloth entrusted to him: *ibidem*, nos. 4 and 7, respectively. We do not know whether the weight of the cheese was established according to the Venetian *milliarium* or that of Candia, equivalent to 477 and about 512 kg., respectively. The latter *milliarium* would have been used if the cheese was purchased in Crete. For these weights, see D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit.

¹⁶ On this cheese, see A. HARVEY, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900-1200*, Cambridge, 1989, pp. 156-157, and below, n. 36.

¹⁷ See below.

¹⁸ See above, n. 13.

ducted in Cairo in 1097-1098, found in the Genizah, we learn that the high-quality Cretan epithymon or dodder of thyme, a medicinal plant, was available in Egypt and reexported from there to the Indian Ocean¹⁹. The presence of this plant supposes trade in additional commodities between Crete and Egypt, yet we do not know whether it was carried out with the help of Byzantine, Venetian or Muslim ships.

In the absence of information, it is also impossible to determine whether these crafts sailed from Crete to Alexandria on a direct course or travelled along the longer, safer route via Rhodes. The second itinerary seems nevertheless more plausible in the light of another Genizah letter from about the mid-eleventh century²⁰. The Jewish author of this letter records the tribulations he endured on his journey from Alexandria to Amalfi²¹. Since the ship he had boarded sailed for some time along the coast of Asia Minor, it may have been Amalfitan²². The Amalfitans were then active both in Byzantium and Egypt as well as in shipping between these countries, and this itinerary was thus familiar to them²³. However, instead of sailing westward through the Aegean, the vessel on which the Jewish merchant travelled was compelled to pursue its voyage further north along the coast of Asia Minor, because of pirates, and reached a point close to Constantinople. Still under threat, the ship then changed course and crossed the Aegean toward Crete, yet after leaving

¹⁹ S.D. GOITEIN, *From the Mediterranean to India: Documents on the Trade to India, South Arabia, and East Africa from the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, in «Speculum», 29, 1954, p. 192; ID., *A Mediterranean Society* cit., p. 47. *

²⁰ On maritime routes between Italy and Egypt, see J.H. PRYOR cit., pp. 94-97, yet see below my reservations about the role of Crete in this framework.

²¹ S.D. GOITEIN (trans.), *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*, Princeton, 1973, pp. 44-45.

²² A Muslim vessel would have sailed along the African coast in a westward direction after leaving Egypt: see below, n. 53.

²³ See M. BALARD, *Amalfi et Byzance (X^e-XII^e siècles)*, in «Travaux et mémoires», 6, 1976, pp. 87-92; S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., pp. 7-8; B. FIGLIUOLO, *Amalfi e il Levante nel medioevo*, in G. AIRALDI e B.Z. KEDAR (eds.), *I comuni italiani nel Regno crociato di Gerusalemme*, Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da Geo Pistarino, 48, Genova, 1986, pp. 581-600, 609-611; D. JACOBY, *The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Comnenian to the Palaeologan Period*, in «Vizantijskij Vremennik», 55, 1994 [in press].

the island returned to it, apparently for provisioning. Finally, when the pirates, most likely Byzantine subjects, were on their way to the Muslim coast, the vessel proceeded to Amalfi along an unspecified route. It follows that, originally, no direct sailing from Alexandria to Crete had been contemplated.

The chrysobull issued by Emperor Alexios I Komnenos in favor of Venice in 1082 granted extensive privileges, primarily freedom of trade in all commodities and total exemption from commercial and shipping taxes throughout the Empire. It is noteworthy that all the cities and islands listed in it were either situated along the waterway linking Venice to Constantinople and this city to northern Syria, or close to it, except Adrianople²⁴. The Venetians already conducted trade in some of them, as in Thebes and Dyrrachion or Durazzo, and were presumably envisaging the extension of their activity to others in the near future²⁵. Crete is conspicuously absent from the charter of 1082, as well as from the chrysobull of 1126 issued by Emperor John II Komnenos, which reproduced its text²⁶. This absence supposedly implies that the Venetians did not enjoy their privileges in Crete and that the emperors possibly even intended to prevent them from trading in the island²⁷. Whatever the case, it is clear that the volume of Venetian trade with Crete was still quite small at that time and the prospects of its development rather slim, compared with Venetian activity and expectations elsewhere in the Empire. Indeed, there is no evidence whatsoever that in 1082 Venetian

²⁴ G.L.F. TAFEL und G.M. THOMAS (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Wien, 1856-1857, I, pp. 51-54 [hereafter: T. TH.]; new ed. by M. POZZA e G. RAVEGNANI (eds.), *I trattati con Bisanzio, 992-1198, Pacta veneta*, 4, Venezia, 1993, pp. 35-45.

²⁵ On Venetian trade in Thebes before 1082, see D. JACOBY, *Silk* cit., pp. 479, 494-495. On Durazzo, see A. DUCELLIER, *La façade maritime de l'Albanie au Moyen Age. Durazzo et Valona du XI^e au XV^e siècle*, Thessaloniki, 1981, pp. 70-72, yet instead of 1084 read 1082.

²⁶ T. TH. cit., I, pp. 95-98; new ed. POZZA e RAVEGNANI cit., pp. 51-56.

²⁷ See R.-J. LILIE, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeleri (1081-1204)*, Amsterdam, 1984, pp. 11, 15-16; S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., pp. 19-20; D. TSUGARAKIS cit., p. 290. For a different approach, see D. JACOBY, *Italian Privileges and Trade in Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade: A Reconsideration*, in «Anuario de estudios medievales», 24, 1994, pp. 351-354.

vessels bound for Constantinople or Egypt regularly called in the island's ports or sailed along its coasts. The navigational considerations revealed by the mid-eleventh century Genizah letter examined above were apparently still valid, and the visits of Venetian merchants in Crete rather limited in number. Largely similar conditions prevailed even in 1126, despite an apparent increase in Venetian trade, examined below, in the years preceding the delivery of the new imperial charter in that year²⁸. Significantly, the Venetian war fleet dispatched in 1122 to the Holy Land, which was not involved in sea-borne trade, sailed along what must have been the common maritime route from Corfu to Rhodes through the Aegean. On its return voyage in 1125 it took more or less the same route, plundering Rhodes, several other islands, and Modon in the southwestern Peloponnese²⁹. Both times Crete was entirely left out.

The detour of a voyage via Crete became profitable only if sustained by trade. This was increasingly the case in the twelfth century. The growing Venetian interest in the island arose against the background of two important developments, one of them particular to Venice and the other to Byzantium. The progressive integration of Venetian seaborne trade within the internal Byzantine commercial and transportation systems has already been mentioned. This process was furthered by the economic and social evolution in the Empire. In the eleventh century the social elite and the urban middle stratum, primarily in Constantinople, shared a growth in purchasing power, changing consumption patterns, and a greater inclination toward the display of luxury in dress, food and other spheres of life. These developments are illustrated by their growing demand for agricultural and pastoral commodities and for finished goods, such as silk textiles, brought in from distant provinces³⁰. Under these circumstances, the shipping and marketing of Cretan products appeared to be increasingly attractive.

The earliest explicit evidence about Venetian trade in Crete after 1082 appears in 1110 or 1111. Pietro Orio and Michele Titino had apparently left Venice on a vessel bound for the island on its way to

²⁸ Contrary to S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., p. 20, Crete was thus not an indispensable stopover in 1111.

²⁹ On its itinerary, see R.-J. LILIE, *Handel* cit., pp. 370-372.

³⁰ D. JACOBY, *Silk* cit., pp. 472-473, 493-495.

Constantinople. They either concluded their *compagna* contract before reaching Crete or, rather, in the island itself, where they went around buying *agrarium*, a reference to agricultural and pastoral products. In April 1111 Michele Titino delivered in Constantinople the proceeds from the sale of the merchandise belonging to his deceased partner to the latter's brothers³¹. The shipment from Crete must have included cheese and possibly also wine³². Cheese seems all the more likely because in 1121 Domenico Titino, a brother of Michele, sold this commodity in Constantinople to two other Venetians³³. The journey of 1110 or 1111 via Crete does not seem to have been unusual and Venetian trade in the island was presumably on the rise. However, Venetian activity in Crete was hampered by Byzantine customs officials. The growing Venetian involvement in Cretan trade most likely accounts for Venice's request to Emperor John II, made about 1136, to ensure that the Venetians trading in Crete enjoy the same freedom of trade and tax exemptions as elsewhere in the Empire. At Venice's insistence, Manuel I Komnenos explicitly referred to this injunction in 1147³⁴. There is good reason to believe that from then on the Venetian merchants benefited in Crete from improved trading conditions and that their activity in the island expanded until 12 March 1171, when they and their possessions were seized on the orders of Manuel I, unless they had managed to escape³⁵.

³¹ D. C. V. cit., no. 33: *compagnia magna vel parva quae tu fecisti et habuisti [...]* quando insimul ambulastis in Creti cum agrario. Giovanni Aurio or Orio, one of the brothers of the deceased merchant, was also present in Constantinople in the previous year and left the city on board the ship that transported the relics of St. Stephen the Martyr to Venice: see the list of passengers in S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., p. 66, n. 11, and the background pp. 65-67. The analysis of the charter of 1111 by E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 171, 442-444, is incorrect and leads to unwarranted conclusions, namely that the Venetians were already settled at that time in Crete and that the island was then an indispensable stopover on the way from Venice to the Crusader states and Alexandria, which was clearly not the case.

³² On wine, see below, n. 40.

³³ D. C. V. cit., no. 46.

³⁴ T. TH. cit, I, pp. 113-124, esp. 124; new ed. by POZZA e RAVEGNANI cit., pp. 60-65. For the dating of the emperor's instructions to about 1136, see R.-J. LILIE, *Handel* cit. pp. 374- 375.

³⁵ See below, n. 38.

By 1147 Cretan cheese was well known and appreciated in Constantinople. The Byzantine writer Michael Italikos must have tasted it before leaving the city in 1143 to serve as metropolitan of Philippopolis in northern Thrace. He considered it superior to Vlach cheese³⁶. Significantly, a Greek satirical poem by the so-called Ptochoprodromos refers to the Venetian quarter in Constantinople as the place where good-quality cheese can be bought. The poem does not mention the provenance of this cheese, yet it is a fair guess that it originated in Crete. Cretan cheese appears elsewhere in the poem as available in Constantinople and we have already noted somewhat earlier evidence suggesting that Venetian merchants exported it to the capital³⁷. The work of Ptochoprodromos should be dated before 12 March 1171, when the forceful action of Emperor Manuel I against the Venetians entailed the loss of their quarter for some twelve years³⁸. We may thus safely assume that the Venetians acquired a dominant role in the import of Cretan cheese to Constantinople prior to this event, presumably as early as the first half of the twelfth century. Since they resumed their activity in the Empire on a small scale a few years after March 1171, they presumably engaged anew in the shipping of Cretan cheese to the capital³⁹. It is not ex-

³⁶ P. GAUTIER (ed.), *Michel Italikos. Lettres et discours*, «Archives de l'Orient chrétien», 14, Paris, 1972, pp. 237-238, esp. 42.

³⁷ H. EIDENEIER (ed. and trans.), *Ptochoprodromos*, in «Neograeca medii aevi», V, Köln, 1991, p. 145, IV, vv. 109, 120-122 (ἐπὶ τοὺς Βενετικούς, in a geographical context clearly pointing to the Venetian quarter), and v. 210, pp. 145, 150; German trans. pp. 202 and 204. On the author and dating of the poems, see *ibid.*, pp. 30-34, 38-40, yet the dating must be corrected: see below. Though Cretan cheese was generally considered a delicacy, the cheese appearing in the first of these instances was of poor quality.

³⁸ On Venetian trade in the Empire between 1171 and 1192, see R.-J. LILIE, *Handel* cit., pp. 226-228; S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., pp. 22-27, 39-60, 98-99, 112-115, 127; D. JACOBY, *Conrad, Marquis of Montferrat, and the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1187-1192)*, in L. BALLETO (ed.), *Atti del Congresso Internazionale «Dai feudi monferrini e dal Piemonte ai nuovi mondi oltre gli Oceani»*, Alessandria, 1993, p. 221. In any event, a dating of the relevant passage after the autumn of 1183, when the Venetians resettled their quarter, is excluded if we identify the author with Theodore Prodromos, who died about 1170. On the latter, see *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford, 1991, III, pp. 1726-1727.

³⁹ On Venetian trade in Constantinople between 1171 and 1183, see previous note. Venetian activity within this period, for instance in 1175, is attested for Thebes and was apparently resumed earlier: see D. JACOBY, *Silk* cit., pp. 495-496.

cluded that in the twelfth century the Venetians also exported sweet Cretan wine to Constantinople, where it was highly appreciated along other good-quality wines⁴⁰. It is noteworthy that Venetian merchants conveyed Peloponnesian olive oil to the capital⁴¹.

It appears likely that the Venetians were also exporting Cretan products to the Levant as early as the eleventh century. We have already hinted at this possibility in our analysis of the Genizah letter of the 1060s or early 1070s⁴². Cheese was a staple food in high demand in Egypt. The Arab historian al-Musabbiḥī, who died in 1029, mentions a *dār al-jubn* in Misr or Cairo, a *funduq* or fondaco where imported cheeses were traded under state supervision⁴³. Cretan cheese was presumably among the 'Rum' cheeses reaching Egypt in this period, in addition to the produce of Sicily and Asia Minor⁴⁴. An eleventh or twelfth century letter written in Alexandria deals with the production of cheese fit for Jewish consumption, apparently in Crete⁴⁵. Between 1139 and 1154 the Arab geographer al-Idrīsī praised Cretan cheese, exported to many countries, and re-

⁴⁰ H. EIDENEIER cit., IV, vv. 332-333, p. 157, trans. p. 208. Though possible, Venetian trade in Cretan wine in this period is not directly documented and, in any event, should not be deduced from evidence bearing on later centuries, as done by A. HARVEY cit., pp. 146-147 and esp. 175. For the later period, see J. CHRYSOSTOMIDES, *Venetian Commercial Privileges under the Palaeologi*, in «Studi veneziani», 12, 1970, pp. 298-311, and D. JACOBY, *Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Roumanie du XIII^e au milieu du XV^e siècle*, in «Travaux et mémoires», 8, 1981, pp. 225-226, repr. in Id., *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion*, Northampton, 1989, no. IX.

⁴¹ A. LOMBARDO e R. MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA (eds.), *Nuovi documenti del commercio veneto dei sec. XI-XIII*, Venezia, 1953, no. 11, issued in 1151, yet with a reference to the expedition of King Roger II of Sicily to Greece in 1147; the same deal is mentioned in no. 9, drafted in 1150; also D. C. V. cit., nos. 316, 320, 338, 358, 360 and 361, with references to Sparta and the arrest of the Venetians in the Empire in March 1171.

⁴² See above, n. 13.

⁴³ T. BIANQUIS, *Le fonctionnement des Diwān financiers d'après al-Musabbiḥī*, in «Annales islamologiques», 26, 1992, p. 58, and dating, p. 49.

⁴⁴ S.D. GOITEIN, *A Mediterranean Society* cit., I, pp. 46, 124.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, I, p. 429, n. 66. I wish to thank hereby Dr. Stefan C. Reif, who has kindly informed me that the letter, which probably belonged to the Cairo Genizah, is now at the Cambridge University Library and listed there as Or. 2116.10.

ferred to Rabd-el-jubn, the 'cheese hamlet', most likely Chandax⁴⁶. His contemporary the Arab geographer al-Zuhri was more specific, since he reported between 1137 and 1154 that dry Cretan cheese was sold in Misr, possibly in the *funduq* attested more than a century earlier⁴⁷. The shipping of Cretan cheese to Alexandria is further illustrated by the taxation treatise compiled about 1170 by al-Makhzūmī. This author mentions convoys or a large number of ships, presumably of small tonnage, arriving from Crete to Alexandria and lists Cretan cheese among the commodities they brought along⁴⁸. It is likely that Venetian merchants visiting Crete were involved in this trade, since they also exported oil from the Peloponnese to Egypt, as attested in 1135⁴⁹.

More evidence on Venetian trade in Crete is offered by notarial charters. Otto Falier sailed in 1129 or 1130 from Venice via Crete to Syria and apparently pursued his voyage elsewhere before returning to Venice. Some time before 1161 Giacomo Venier travelled from Constantinople via Crete to Alexandria with horsehair, yet undoubtedly took advantage of the stopover in the island to acquire local commodities. In 1165 Romano Mairano envisaged a journey from Acre to Crete and from there either to Acre, Antioch or Alexandria. One of the purposes of this voyage was clearly the purchase of Cretan products⁵⁰. Acre imported cheese from Apulia in the thirteenth century⁵¹. It is quite possible that it also received Cretan cheese in

⁴⁶ P.-A. JAUBERT (trans.), *La géographie d'Edrisi*, Paris, 1836-1840, II, p. 126. The identification with Chandax is the most plausible. Under Venetian rule Candia was an important center of cheese production: see D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit. This may already have been the case in the Byzantine period.

⁴⁷ H. HADJ-SADOK (ed.), *Kitāb al-Dja'rāfiyya. Mappemonde du calife al-Ma'mun, reproduite par Fāzarī (III^e/IX^e s.), rééditée et commentée par Zuhri (VI^e/XII^e s.)*, in «Bulletin d'études orientales», 21, 1968, pp. 175-176, par. 358 (Arabic text), and for the dating, p. 25. On the other hand, about 1140 a large quantity of Sicilian cheese was traded in a *dār wakāla* or warehouse of a representative of the merchants: S. D. GOITEIN, *A Mediterranean Society* cit., I, p. 380, no. 51, and see *ibidem*, pp. 186-189.

⁴⁸ C. CAHEN, *Douanes et commerce dans les ports méditerranéens de l'Egypte médiévale d'après le Minhadj d'al-Makhzūmī*, Leiden, 1964, pp. 235, 286, n. 2, 308-309.

⁴⁹ D. C. V. cit., no. 65.

⁵⁰ D. C. V. cit., nos. 56-57, 149, 159, 167.

⁵¹ FRANCESCO BALDUCCI PEGOLOTTI, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. EVANS, Cambridge, Mass., 1936, p. 66.

the twelfth century, like Egypt, an assumption apparently supported by an Arabic source that will soon be adduced. In any event, it appears that by the second half of the twelfth century the volume of Venetian trade with Crete had increased. Moreover, by then the island was fully inserted within the Venetian commercial and navigation networks and served as a station on one of the alternative sailing routes of Venetian ships in the Eastern Mediterranean.

In comparison with Venice, Genoa was a latecomer in the Eastern Mediterranean. Its seaborne trade expanded to this region only about the middle of the eleventh century. By the 1060s Genoese traders were already sailing for some time to Egypt, yet a Jewish merchant writing then from Alexandria wondered at their lack of experience with oriental wares. It was thus only fairly recently that the Genoese had extended their activity beyond the limits of the maritime space in which they had previously traded and had discovered the potential benefit to be reaped further east. Since the 1060s some Genoese ships were also pursuing their voyage from Egypt further north along the Levantine coast⁵². There is no indication about the itinerary they followed on their way from Genoa to Alexandria, yet we may assume that they sailed from Sicily to Egypt along the North African coast, like Muslim vessels, despite the inconveniences and dangers of this route⁵³. Byzantine waters apparently remained
* beyond their reach until the First Crusade.

The first fleet to leave Genoa in support of the Crusade sailed through the Aegean and arrived in northern Syria in 1097. Others travelled later to the Levant along the same maritime lane, common

⁵² B.Z. KEDAR, *Mercanti genovesi in Alessandria d'Egitto negli anni sessanta del secolo XI*, in «Miscellanea di studi storici II», Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da Geo Pistarino, 38, Genova, 1983, pp. 19-30.

⁵³ On the sailing route of Muslim ships, see S.D. GOITEIN, *A Mediterranean Society* cit., I, pp. 211-213, 317-325; A.L. UDOVITCH, *Time, the Sea and Society: Duration of Commercial Voyages on the Southern Shores of the Mediterranean during the High Middle Ages*, in «La navigazione nell'alto medioevo. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo, XXV», Spoleto, 1978, pp. 503-546; J.H. PRYOR cit., pp. 21-22, 38. This was also the route followed by some western pilgrims until the beginning of the eleventh century: F. MICHEAU, *Les itinéraires maritimes et continentaux des pèlerinages vers Jérusalem*, in «Occident et Orient au X^e siècle. Actes du IX^e Congrès de la Société des Historiens Médiévistes de l'Enseignement Supérieur Public (Dijon, juin 1978)», Publications de l'Université de Dijon, 57, Paris, 1979, pp. 81-85, 90.

to all western ships bound for this region in the following years⁵⁴. Fatimid naval activity excluded sailing along the southern waterway off the Egyptian coast. In the first half of the twelfth century the growing seaborne commerce with the newly established Crusader states of the Levant presumably led Genoese merchants to engage occasionally in trade in some of the islands situated along their navigation route to Syria. Yet only since the 1130s do we find evidence that they ventured northward of the west-east route and reached Constantinople. Two letters apparently written in this period and preserved in a stylised version in an *Ars dictandi* reveal that two Genoese partners were travelling between Genoa, Egypt and Constantinople on what appear to have been rather common journeys⁵⁵. One of them planned to leave Egypt for the Byzantine capital on a ship carrying Italian merchants and the ambassadors of the Egyptian ruler⁵⁶. The presence of the merchants on board suggests that the vessel was Italian, though not necessarily Genoese⁵⁷. Whatever the case, the ship must have sailed along the coasts of the Levant and Asia Minor toward the Byzantine capital⁵⁸. Significantly, the other Genoese merchant mentioned in the letters, one G. Embriaco, intended to travel to Constantinople via Bari on a local ship, which must have crossed the Adriatic, run through the Corfu Channel and proceeded around the Peloponnese to the Byzantine capital⁵⁹. The boarding of a foreign ship seems to imply that in the 1130s Genoese vessels were not yet reaching Constantinople, or rarely did so. It is quite possible, then, that the first stage of Genoa's commercial expansion as far as

⁵⁴ M.-L. FAVREAU-LILIE, *Die Italiener im Heiligen Land vom ersten Kreuzzug bis zum Tode Heinrichs von Champagne (1098-1197)*, Amsterdam, 1989, pp. 43-125, *passim*.

⁵⁵ Published by W. WATTENBACH, *Iter austriacum*, 1853, in «Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichtsquellen», 24, 1855, pp. 79-80, nos. XIX-XX. On the reliability of the information they contain, see D. ABULAFIA, *The Two Italies. Economic Relations between the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Northern Communes*, Cambridge, 1977, pp. 74-76.

⁵⁶ W. WATTENBACH cit., p. 80, no. XX.

⁵⁷ His partner travelled on a foreign ship: see below. In the twelfth century it was not uncommon for Muslims to sail on Italian vessels. See below, pp. 535-537.

⁵⁸ On this course, see J.H. PRYOR cit., pp. 89-90, 97-98.

⁵⁹ See *ibidem*, pp. 92-93.

this city was restricted to merchants, without the participation of Genoese ships.

In 1142 Genoa sent two ambassadors to Emperor John II, who was then near Antioch, yet since we have no record about the nature of their talks it is a matter of speculation whether they discussed the granting of privileges to Genoese merchants⁶⁰. In any event, the account of this mission does not refer to Genoese shipping in Byzantine waters which, however, is illustrated by other contemporary sources. The consuls Lanfranco Piper and Ansaldo Mallone, in office from 1136 to February 1139, decreed that vessels returning from Romania should pay a tax in kind amounting to one *mina* of grain to an officer of the Commune, the *cintraco*. This rule, confirmed in 1142, may hint at grain imports from Crete, Macedonia, Thessaly or Thrace⁶¹. An entry of the following year in the *Registrum curiae archiepiscopalis Januae* mentions tithes and taxes imposed upon vessels arriving from Romania, and in 1147 the archbishop of Genoa requested a payment from Bonifacio de Ranfredo after his return from a naval expedition in this region⁶².

The peace treaty concluded in 1149 between Genoa and Pisa seems to offer more precise evidence about the range of Genoese shipping⁶³. Since it was to be valid in the entire Mediterranean «as far as Constantinople», it suggests that by then the sailing of ships from Genoa to the Byzantine capital had become more common. The itinerary of these ships can be reconstructed from a reference found in the Genoese letters mentioned above. The merchant who had left Egypt for Constantinople was asked by his wife to purchase

⁶⁰ See G.W. DAY, *Genoa's Response to Byzantium, 1155-1204. Commercial Expansion and Factionalism in a Medieval City*, Urbana and Chicago, 1988, p. 24.

⁶¹ C. IMPERIALE DI SANT'ANGELO (ed.), *Codice diplomatico della repubblica di Genova dal MCLXIII al MCLXXXX*, Roma, 1936-1942, I, p. 142 [hereafter: C. D. G.]. Witnesses called to testify in a case involving trade with another region and entailing the same tax referred to the two consuls, on whose terms of office see *ibid.*, pp. 93-94 and 115. On grain exports from Crete, see above, n. 8, and from the other regions, A. HARVEY cit., pp. 139, 222.

⁶² L.T. BELGRANO (ed.), *Il registro della curia arcivescovile di Genova*, in «Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria», II/2, 1862, p. 9, cap. XVI, and p. 118.

⁶³ C. D. G. cit., I, p. 244.

silk fabrics produced in Andros. This island served as a stopover on one of the maritime routes linking the Byzantine capital to Italy via Chios, the Cyclades and the Peloponnese⁶⁴. Further evidence on Genoese trade in the Empire, yet without information about specific ports, is provided by the Genoese chronicler Caffaro, who mentions the full rate of the *kommerkion* or customs due before it was reduced in October 1155, as a result of Genoa's treaty with Emperor Manuel I⁶⁵. In 1175 Genoa requested compensations for damage inflicted upon Genoese merchants in the Empire *ante conventionem Demetrii*, a reference to Demetrios Makrembolites, the envoy of Manuel I who signed the treaty of 1155⁶⁶. Lack of evidence prevents us from assessing the volume or importance of Genoese trade and shipping in Romania from the 1130s to 1155. It is obvious, though, that only a marked increase in the interest displayed by Genoese merchants and ship operators in this region would explain the negotiations leading to the grant of privileges by Manuel I.

The sources of the first half of the twelfth century documenting the activity of Genoese merchants and the sailing of Genoese vessels in Romania do not include a single reference to Crete. It is impossible to determine whether this reflects the pattern of their activity or, rather, is due to the paucity of the surviving documentation. In any event, only with the intensification of Genoese activity in the Byzantine Empire, particularly in Constantinople, could there be any prospects of profitable trade in Crete, the island serving as a stopover on the way. Such conditions may have already existed before the signing of the treaty of 1155 with Manuel I. This is suggested by the geographical surname of Guglielmo *de Candida*, attested in Genoa in 1157, which implies that this individual either had resided for some time in Chandax or Candia, or possibly was still living there. It is noteworthy that he invested in Genoa a sum of money in a trade venture directed toward Constantinople, presumably with a call in the

⁶⁴ See J.H. PRYOR cit., p. 97; E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 444-445.

⁶⁵ L.T. BELGRANO-C. IMPERIALE DI SANT'ANGELO (eds.), *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori dal MXCIX al MCCXCIII*, Roma, 1890-1929 [henceforth: *Annali Genovesi*], I, p. 42.

⁶⁶ C. D. G. cit., II, pp. 216-217, and the treaty of 1155, *ibid.*, I, pp. 327-330. On these requests, see also below.

port of Candia on the way⁶⁷. By 1160 it was apparently not unusual for Genoese vessels to change the course of their voyages in order to stop in a Cretan port. A Genoese merchant leaving then Constantinople for Alexandria was offered the choice to sail either directly to Egypt or make a detour via Crete⁶⁸. The charters of 1157 and 1160 just mentioned imply that for Genoese merchants and ships trade in Crete could be profitable, provided it was integrated into a pattern of trans-Mediterranean sailings. They also illustrate the fact that the island was not an indispensable stopover for Genoese ships bound to or from Constantinople. It is likely that most of these vessels continued to sail from the Byzantine capital to Genoa along the Greek mainland, as hinted by the burning of a Genoese vessel in the port of Halmyros and the seizure of another in the port of Euripos, the capital of Euboea, both at the hands of Venetians⁶⁹. The two incidents occurred in 1171, in the framework of the Venetian retaliation for the action of Manuel I against them on 12 March of that year.

Unfortunately, the Genoese notarial documents of 1157 and 1160 are the only ones to refer to Crete in the second half of the twelfth century. One should remember, though, that for this period the Genoese notarial evidence is fragmentary and concentrated within a small number of years. Moreover, the parties involved in commercial and maritime ventures generally referred to their destinations, rather than to ports of call on the way. Yet other sources of that period offer some evidence regarding the visits of Genoese ships in Cretan ports and the involvement of Genoese merchants in the export of Cretan products. In 1175 Genoa demanded from Emperor Manuel I compensations for damages inflicted by his officials and subjects upon Genoese merchants in previous years. Except in one case, it is impossible to determine the dating of the incidents related

⁶⁷ M. CHIAUDANO - M. MORESCO (eds.), *Il cartolare di Giovanni Scriba*, Torino, 1935, no. 219. The following year Guglielmo, this time called *de Candea*, provided together with a partner a loan to two individuals bound for Sicily and the Crusader Levant; in 1163 he appeared in another deal, without reference to a specific destination: *ibidem*, nos. 422 and 1103.

⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, no. 752.

⁶⁹ C. D. G., II, p. 213 and n. 1; p. 215 and n. 2. The second vessel was *sub fiducia sacri imperii et in eius tutamine*; at Halmyros the Genoese participated in the defense of the city.

to the island ⁷⁰. In one of them the cargo of a ship anchoring in Chandax or Candia had been robbed by the crew of an imperial galley. There is no indication about the navigation course of the Genoese vessel ⁷¹. A *kommerkiarios* or customs official stationed in the island had confiscated various commodities from another Genoese ship on her way from Constantinople to Genoa, although the *kommerkion* for the merchandise had already been paid earlier. The duke of Crete had seized 300 hyperpers from a third Genoese ship sailing to Adramyttion ⁷². According to a confused passage, John Straboromanos, who governed Crete for some time, took wool apparently originating in the island from a Genoese ship that later sunk close to Rhodes ⁷³. The ship's loss in this area implies that she was on her way to the Crusader Levant ⁷⁴. A certain Apokaukos, appointed by Constantine Angelos to the governorship of Crete, had confiscated various objects and commodities from another ship on her way from Constantinople to Genoa. The cargo included grain bought in the Empire's capital, as well as six *milliaria* or 3,072 kg. of cheese and four *milliaria* of honey, both in all likelihood produced in the island ⁷⁵. The large quantity of cheese was far more than needed for the feeding of the crew ⁷⁶. Consequently, we may assume that it was partly intended for sale on board the ship. This was apparently customary, as we learn from the Arab traveller Ibn Jubayr. In 1184 he

⁷⁰ I will deal elsewhere with this dating. The list of claims was handed over to the Genoese ambassador Grimaldi in December 1174 and submitted by him to the emperor in the following year: C. D. G. cit., II, pp. 206-222.

⁷¹ C. D. G. cit., II, p. 217, note, col. 2.

⁷² C. D. G. cit., II, p. 218, note, col. 1.

⁷³ C. D. G. cit., II, pp. 216-217, note: *et abstulit sibi pro lana que apud Constanti-nopolim cuidam de Creta ablata fuit, de quibus omnibus coram imperatore lamentatio facta fuit*. A more satisfactory reading is obtained by transferring *apud Constantino-polim* after *coram imperatore*. On Straboromanos, see E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 489-490, and P. MAGDALINO cit., pp. 220-221.

⁷⁴ See above, p. 523.

⁷⁵ C. D. G. cit., II, p. 218, note, col. 1. For the Cretan *milliarium* of cheese, see D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit. On the production of honey in Crete, see G. CERVellini cit., p. 14, and D. TSUGARAKIS cit., p. 287. On Apokaukos, see P. MAGDALINO cit., pp. 220-221, and 208.

⁷⁶ On the daily consumption of cheese by crews, see D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit.

sailed from Acre to Sicily on a Genoese vessel, the captain of which sold victuals to the passengers, including cheese⁷⁷.

Further evidence on Genoese trade in Crete appears in the taxation treatise of al-Makhzūmī, compiled about 1170. An example of tax registration in Alexandria cites the name of Guglielmo the Genoese in connection with the arrival of merchandise from Crete which, as we have noted, occasionally included cheese⁷⁸. The Arab chronicler al-Maqrīzī reports that the Egyptian fleet seized in the year 587 A. H., i. e. between 29 January 1191 and 17 January 1192, a foreign vessel loaded with «twenty-two thousand cheeses, each cheese the size of a hand mill and beyond a man's lifting»⁷⁹. The last detail in this colorful description should perhaps not be taken at face value, yet if we assume that the information about the quantity of cheese is more or less correct, its total weight may have reached some 180 metric tons⁸⁰. In all likelihood the merchandise was intended for the supply of the sizeable Christian army assembled in the Holy Land during the siege of Acre, which ended on 12 July 1191, as well as in the following year. Long-distance seaborne trade with this region was then basically geared to the war economy⁸¹. The provenance of the large consignment of cheese is not stated, yet there is good reason to believe that it originated in Crete, since the island was then an important producer of this commodity, closer to the Holy Land than other regions exporting cheese, and visited by merchants and vessels on their way to the Levant. The ship transporting the cheese must have either been Venetian or Genoese, since only these vessels are known to have been involved at that time in the export of Cretan products to foreign countries.

In addition to Genoese ships using Crete as a stopover, others sailed along the island's coasts on their way to and from Romania, the Crusader Levant and Muslim countries. Such was the case with

⁷⁷ R.J.C. BROADHURST (trans.), *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, London, 1951, p. 329; on the ship's identity, see p. 327.

⁷⁸ See above, p. 529.

⁷⁹ R.J.C. BROADHURST (trans.), *A History of the Ayyubid Sultans of Egypt, translated from the Arabic of al-Maqrīzī*, Boston, 1980, p. 95.

⁸⁰ The largest pieces of cheese documented in thirteenth century Crete weighed 8.2 kg. each: see D. JACOBY, *Cretan Cheese* cit.

⁸¹ On the nature of this trade, see D. JACOBY, *Conrad* cit., pp. 217-221.

those boarded by the Muslim traveller Ibn Jubayr, the first on his way from Sicily to Alexandria in 1183 and the other from Acre to Sicily in the following year. They passed along the southern coast of Crete⁸². Similarly, the Genoese ships hired by King Philip II Augustus of France proceeded in 1191 from Sicily south of Crete to Rhodes on their way to Acre⁸³. On his return from the Levant in 1200 or 1201 the Genoese Enrico Grillo was robbed of his ship and her cargo by the Greeks of Candia⁸⁴. In 1204 Genoese vessels under the corsair Alamanno da Costa cruising close to Crete met Genoese crafts returning from commercial ventures in the Crusader Levant and in Egypt⁸⁵. A marked change in maritime routes had taken place since the first half of the twelfth century. Two of the four itineraries implied by the geographic treatise of al-Idrīsī, compiled between 1139 and 1154, led from the Peloponnese to Crete and from there to Cyprus⁸⁶. By contrast, the Genoese vessel on which Ibn Jubayr travelled eastwards proceeded from the vicinity of Crete to Alexandria on a straight course, without anchoring on the way. The ship on which he returned to the West crossed the high seas from Acre and after sailing for twenty-six days reached an Aegean island close to Crete. She pursued her westward voyage and arrived in Calabria after twenty-one days, again without anchoring on the way⁸⁷.

It has been claimed that there was collusion between the Venetians, imperial officials and the indigenous social elite in the Byzantine islands against the Genoese. This would explain the latter's harassment, some cases of which have been noted above. As a result, the development of Genoese trade is supposed to have been severely

⁸² R.J.C. BROADHURST, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr* cit., pp. 29, 330-332.

⁸³ Somewhat earlier King Richard Coeur de Lion's fleet touched the southern coast of Crete on its way to the Crusader Levant: see J.H. PRYOR cit., pp. 37, 70-71, 74. On this itinerary, see also B.R. MOTZO (ed.), *Il Compasso da Navigare. Opera italiana della metà del secolo XIII*, Cagliari, 1947, pp. 50-51, 114-123.

⁸⁴ C. D. G. cit., III, p. 198: the robbery took place *cum [...] pervenisset ad Candi-dam ad Sanctum Georgium*. One should presumably read *de sancto Georgio*, a locality on the northeastern coast of Melos, an island close to Crete: B.R. MOTZO cit., pp. 48, 50.

⁸⁵ *Annali Genovesi* cit., II, p. 91.

⁸⁶ P.-A. JAUBERT cit., II, p. 126-130; see the maps in E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 661-662.

⁸⁷ R.J.C. BROADHURST, *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr* cit., pp. 28-29, 326-335.

hampered⁸⁸. This sweeping statement, also applying to Crete, is totally unwarranted. The chance survival of the Genoese claims presented in 1175 and the absence of similar Venetian claims for that period should not lead us astray. There is no evidence, whether direct or indirect, to support the allegation of collusion, nor any reason to suppose that it ever occurred, considering the shifting nature and evolution of the Empire's relations with both Venice and Genoa in the twelfth century. Moreover, it was in the best interest of the Cretans selling local surpluses to stimulate competition between Genoese and Venetian merchants. And, finally, the latter occasionally suffered as much as the Genoese from the unilateral actions of Byzantine officials, as in Crete itself in the first half of the twelfth century⁸⁹. The infringement of privileges by imperial officials was so common throughout the Empire that in 1169 Manuel I devised a procedure for the handling of Genoese requests for redress five years later⁹⁰. Similar infringements occurred in periods of the thirteenth century in which the Empire's relations with Venice and Genoa were supposedly normal. Venice in 1278 and Genoa in 1290 and 1294 submitted long lists of grievances⁹¹. Occasionally, vexations could be averted by the bribing of the *kommerkiarioi*, their scribes and their interpreters, a common practice in Constantinople attested by the fourteenth century Pegolotti⁹².

While the Genoese were not the victims of a conspiracy, they faced serious obstacles in their trade with Crete. When they entered the local market, presumably about 1150, the Venetians had already ensured themselves a portion of it. In addition, the Genoese benefited from a reduction in the rate of one due only, the *kommerkion*,

⁸⁸ See E. MALAMUT cit., pp. 172-173, 445-446.

⁸⁹ See D. JACOBY, *Italian Privileges* cit., as above, n. 27.

⁹⁰ C. D. G. cit., II, p. 113. Numerous cases were submitted in 1175: see *ibidem*, II, pp. 217-220.

⁹¹ Venice: T. TH. cit., III, pp. 159-281, and see G. MORGAN, *The Venetian Claims Commission of 1278*, in «Byzantinische Zeitschrift», 69, 1976, pp. 411-438. Genoa: G. BERTOLOTTI (ed.), *Nuova serie di documenti sulle relazioni di Genova con l'Impero bizantino*, in «Atti della Società Ligure di Storia Patria», 28, 1897, pp. 511-545, and see A.E. LAIOU, *Constantinople and the Latins. The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1282-1328*, Cambridge (Mass.), 1972, pp. 70-73.

⁹² FRANCESCO BALDUCCI PEGOLOTTI cit., p. 42.

whereas their Venetian competitors enjoyed the advantage of being fully exempted from all imperial taxation on trade and shipping⁹³. For the Cretans the sale of domestic surpluses to the Venetians was particularly attractive, since the latter could offer higher purchase prices without losing their competitive edge over Byzantine or other western merchants. Transactions with them were even more advantageous than deals with Byzantines subjects entailing the payment of full dues⁹⁴. The sources we have adduced nevertheless imply an increase in the volume of Genoese trade in Crete in the second half of the twelfth century. This upward trend must have been halted between 1182 and 1192. In this period Genoese commerce in the Empire was rather intermittent and was resumed on a large scale for short periods only, each time in close relation to diplomatic missions and high expectations in Genoa for a renewal of full trading. Some Genoese nevertheless visited Constantinople in these years and even stayed there for some time⁹⁵. These general conditions must have also affected Genoese trade in Crete. In any event, by the second half of the twelfth century the island had clearly become a logistic base on the sailing route of Genoese ships, as illustrated by the purchase of local provisions for the crew and passengers of one of them, mentioned above. By then Crete was firmly integrated within the Mediterranean trade and navigation systems of Genoa.

There is good reason to believe that the Italian merchants expanded their handling and shipping of Cretan products at the expense of local and other Byzantine merchants and ship operators. One should nevertheless not overestimate the Venetian and Genoese impact on the economy of Byzantine Crete in the twelfth century. Except possibly for Guglielmo *de Candida* in the 1150s, there is no evidence of Genoese settlers in the island, which is not surprising since Constantinople was the only Byzantine city in which these were to be found⁹⁶. The Venetians, on the other hand, also settled temporarily

⁹³ On this and other disadvantages, see D. JACOBY, *Italian Privileges* cit., as above, n. 27.

⁹⁴ On these considerations, see A.E. LAIOU, *Byzantine Traders* cit., pp. 84-87.

⁹⁵ See D. JACOBY, *Conrad* cit., pp. 222-223.

⁹⁶ See M. BALARD, *La Romanie génoise (XII^e - début du XV^e siècle)*, Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 235, Rome, 1978, pp. 105-112.

or permanently in provincial cities⁹⁷. It is highly significant, therefore, that this was not the case in Crete until the beginning of the Venetian conquest in the first decade of the thirteenth century. It follows that even for the Venetians the island remained until then of minor importance, compared with their commercial outposts in the Empire.

* * *

The fragmentary evidence we have examined reveals that Crete was definitely not located on the navigation routes of Venetian or other western ships engaged in trans-Mediterranean sailing in the period extending from the Byzantine reconquest of 961 until the eleventh century. Commercial, rather than navigational factors apparently provided the initial incentive for Venetian ships to reach Crete on their way to various trading stations. The island was progressively integrated within the commercial and maritime networks of Venice, a process that presumably began in the early twelfth century. A similar process occurred with respect to Genoa in the second half of that century. An increase in the size of ships enabling the storage of larger quantities of sweet water on board and some advances in navigation techniques in this period may have encouraged merchants and ship operators to cross the high seas more often, in order to shorten navigation times. These developments made it more attractive for them to reach Crete and take advantage of the products and logistic support it offered. Sailing on the high seas remained nevertheless fairly risky, as revealed by two authors of that period, Roger of Hoveden with respect to galleys and Ibn Jubayr with respect to round ships⁹⁸. It should be emphasized that even then Crete was not an indispensable stopover and there were alternative navigation routes bypassing the island. It is clear, though, that by the early thirteenth century the strategic value of Crete had risen. This factor combined with the interest displayed by Venice and Genoa in the economic and fiscal exploitation of the island, and, together, they provided the background for the struggle of the two maritime powers over the possession of Crete soon after the Fourth Crusade.

⁹⁷ See S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* cit., pp. 31-61; R.-J. LILIE, *Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem vierten Kreuzzug. Versuch einer Bestandaufnahme*, in «Byzantinische Zeitschrift», 82, 1989, pp. 202-206, 209-211.

⁹⁸ ROGER OF HOVEDEN, *Chronica*, ed. W. STUBBS, *Rerum Britannicarum medii aevi scriptores*, 51, London, 1868-1871, III, p. 160; for Ibn Jubayr, see above, n. 82. On ships and their navigation course, see also J.H. PRYOR cit., pp. 29-38.

III

LES JUIFS DE BYZANCE: UNE COMMUNAUTÉ MARGINALISÉE

L'objet de cette brève étude est d'examiner la marginalisation des Juifs dans l'Empire byzantin.¹ Il s'agit de déterminer les facteurs qui ont contribué à ce processus, de définir les étapes de ce dernier, d'en circonscrire les manifestations, enfin, d'évaluer la nature spécifique du phénomène. La documentation dont nous disposons est fragmentaire, dispersée, partiellement tendancieuse et souvent d'interprétation difficile; en outre, la problématique du sujet est extrêmement complexe. Dans le cadre de Byzance, état chrétien, l'Église joue un rôle majeur. C'est elle qui constitue le facteur primordial de la marginalisation juive. A ses yeux, l'existence du judaïsme, des Juifs et de l'ethnie juive comporte une dimension théologique et symbolique, qui trouve son prolongement dans l'idéologie et l'action de l'État. Cependant, ce dernier obéit également à d'autres considérations: il y a en effet une dimension réelle, quotidienne de la présence juive, qui se manifeste dans le domaine juridique, social et économique. Entre la dimension théologique et symbolique et la dimension réelle, il existe un rapport dialectique continu tout au long de l'histoire de Byzance, rapport dont

1. Mon but n'est *pas* de retracer ici l'histoire des Juifs de Byzance. C'est pourquoi je me contente de fournir un nombre restreint de références à des sources et des problèmes spécifiques, avec l'accent sur les publications récentes dans lesquelles le lecteur trouvera la bibliographie antérieure. La présentation du sujet au colloque est basée sur un travail plus ample, en cours de préparation.

l'intensité et la nature varient selon les circonstances. C'est dans ce cadre que s'effectue le passage de l'anti-judaïsme à l'antisémitisme.² La marginalisation juive commence donc par le haut: elle est amorcée, poursuivie et appliquée par les représentants de l'autorité spirituelle et les détenteurs du pouvoir politique. Mais, en outre, elle opère également à un autre niveau. Une fois proclamée et concrétisée par l'Église et l'État, elle filtre à travers les strates sociales, façonne dans une grande mesure leurs attitudes et s'exprime dans la mentalité populaire par des stéréotypes et des phantasmes collectifs.

Afin de dégager les caractères particuliers de la marginalisation juive dans l'Empire, une double approche comparative s'impose: d'une part, cette marginalisation doit être examinée face à celle d'autres groupes ethno-religieux minoritaires dans le cadre de la société byzantine; en outre, il faut s'interroger sur les phénomènes de marginalisation juive dans la société chrétienne médiévale de l'Occident, dont les racines théologiques sont identiques à celles de Byzance. Cette double démarche s'avère indispensable pour notre propos, mais, dans le cadre du temps imparti, nous pourrions à peine l'esquisser.³

*
* * *

2. Qu'il ne faut pas confondre, ce qui est précisément le cas dans le récent article «Anti-semitism» in *ODB*, I, pp. 122-123.

3. On peut consulter trois collections de sources, traduites en anglais, commentées et précédées d'exposés synthétiques: A. Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation*, Detroit-Jerusalem, 1987; J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641-1204*, Athens, 1939; S. B. Bowman *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204-1453*, University of Alabama, 1985. Les deux dernières collections ne sont pas exhaustives. De nombreuses études traitent de la littérature polémique anti-juive, dont récemment H. Schreckenberg, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (1.- 11. Jh.)*, 2., überarbeitete Auflage,

Il semble téméraire de vouloir suivre la marginalisation des Juifs tout au long de l'histoire plus que millénaire de Byzance. L'entreprise est pourtant justifiée: le phénomène se poursuit sans solution de continuité, bien qu'il se manifeste sous des formes diverses. Encore faut-il distinguer entre deux tranches chronologiques. La condition et l'évolution de la communauté juive dans l'Empire et des individus qui la composent sont déterminées de manière décisive à la haute époque byzantine. L'attitude et la politique de l'Église et du pouvoir à leur égard ne sont pas fonction de leur nombre, mais s'inscrivent dans le cadre d'un affrontement triangulaire entre le paganisme, le judaïsme et le christianisme, amorcé dès l'époque des apôtres. Cette première période, qui s'achève vers le milieu du VII^e siècle, voit la mise en place des structures théologiques, juridiques, sociales et mentales de la marginalisation juive: les Pères et les conciles de l'Église, la législation impériale, inspirée directement ou indirectement par cette dernière, enfin, la polémique et l'apologétique anti-judaïques et anti-juives contribuent à ce processus. La seconde période commence avec l'expansion arabe du VII^e siècle, qui détache de l'Empire les provinces orientales habitées par le plus important groupement juif, concentré en Palestine et en particulier en Galilée, majoritaire dans cette région pendant une partie de la période byzan-

Frankfurt, 1990, et idem, *Die christlichen Adversus-Judaeos-Texte und ihr literarisches und historisches Umfeld (11.- 13. Jh.)*, mit einer Ikonographie des Judenthemas bis zum 4. Laterankonzil, Frankfurt, 1988; ces deux ouvrages présentent toutefois de sérieuses lacunes pour le domaine byzantin. A. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade*, London, 1971, contient malheureusement de nombreuses erreurs de faits et d'analyse et des affirmations fantaisistes; il faut donc utiliser cet ouvrage avec prudence. Cf. mon compte-rendu dans *BZ* 66 (1973), pp. 403-406.

tine.⁴ Désormais, l'Empire ne comprend plus que de petites communautés juives éparpillées, dénuées d'une structure communautaire d'ensemble. Les Juifs cessent de participer à la vie publique, comme ils l'avaient fait dans le cadre des émeutes urbaines des VI^e et VII^e siècles.⁵ Le temps des grands affrontements de l'Église avec le judaïsme est révolu, la victoire du christianisme dans l'Empire acquise, et la condition juive strictement définie. Pourtant, la marginalisation juive se poursuit dans les siècles suivants sous l'effet d'une virulente propagande ecclésiastique dirigée contre le judaïsme et les Juifs, dans le contexte des bouleversements politiques du VII^e siècle, de la crise iconoclaste, enfin, de la lutte permanente de l'Église impériale contre les hérésies et de son hostilité à l'égard des non-Chrétiens.

Le passage de l'Empire romain d'un pluralisme religieux de fait, malgré l'existence d'une religion officielle, à un régime de religion unique s'accomplit en deux temps.⁶ La proclamation du christianisme en tant que religion licite par Constantin I^{er}, premier empereur chrétien (324-337), lui confère un statut prioritaire parmi les religions pratiquées. Sortie d'une période de vie clandestine et de persécutions, l'Église agit au grand jour et jouit de l'appui de l'État, sauf pendant le bref règne de l'empereur Julien (361-363), dont la politique religieuse traumatise profondément les Chrétiens. La proclamation du christianisme en tant que religion d'État en 380

4. L'évolution des communautés juives de Palestine jusqu'à la conquête arabe relève d'une problématique complexe, en partie différente de celle d'autres régions, et exige un traitement particulier.

5. Sur celles-ci, cf. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 44-45, 47-48; G. Dagron et V. Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens dans l'Orient du VII^e siècle», *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 18-22.

6. Pour l'évolution de l'Église byzantine et le contexte général dans laquelle elle se situe, cf. J. Herrin, *The Formation of Christendom*, Princeton, N. J., 1987.

ouvre une ère nouvelle. La place de l'individu dans la société se définit désormais par son identité religieuse, qui prend le pas sur l'identité culturelle, et l'unicité religieuse que l'Église et l'État s'efforcent d'établir par la christianisation engendre l'intolérance à l'égard de ceux qui refusent de se conformer à leurs vœux. Problème crucial, puisque les premiers siècles de Byzance constituent une période de grande fermentation spirituelle. L'Église est secouée par d'âpres controverses théologiques. En outre, dans les provinces orientales de Syrie et d'Égypte, à majorités ethno-religieuses hétérodoxes, on assiste à un trouble profond quant aux valeurs religieuses et à l'identité ethnique et culturelle. Bref, jusque vers le milieu du VII^e siècle l'Église byzantine traverse une véritable crise permanente, que le pouvoir impérial tente de surmonter en imposant ses propres conceptions doctrinales et en consolidant l'autorité de l'Église de Constantinople, au besoin par la coercition. Il vise donc à la conformité des croyances et des pratiques religieuses et à la centralisation ecclésiastique, compléments indispensables, à ses yeux, de l'unité et de la centralisation sur le plan politique.

La présence et la condition des Juifs dans l'Empire posent toutefois à l'Église un problème particulier, fondamental, dont l'importance découle de l'attitude ambivalente du christianisme à l'égard du judaïsme. L'agressivité des Chrétiens dirigée contre les Juifs et leur religion, manifestée dès l'époque de l'apôtre Paul et accentuée par une polémique intense dès le II^e siècle, traduit un trouble profond, tant doctrinal que psychologique. En effet, l'Église chrétienne est issue du monothéisme juif, ses racines profondes plongent dans la tradition juive, et ce sont les prophètes d'Israël qui, selon l'exégèse chrétienne, annoncent la venue du Christ. L'Église non seulement reconnaît cet héritage, mais affirme l'avoir récupéré à son profit: après la révélation du Christ, c'est elle qui représente le vrai Israël. En conséquence, l'Église rejette le

judaïsme, s'en détache et définit avec force son identité propre face à lui. Déjà l'Évangile selon St. Mathieu présente les Juifs en tant que complices de la mise à mort du Christ, thème développé vers 160 par Melito de Sardes dans un langage acerbe. Dès le début du III^e siècle les polémistes chrétiens, dont Tertullien, disculpent définitivement les Romains du crime de déicide, dans le but de se rapprocher du pouvoir, et en transfèrent la responsabilité entière aux Juifs contemporains de Jésus, ainsi qu'à leurs descendants.⁷ Dans les premiers siècles de son existence, l'Église affronte donc un problème juif autrement plus complexe que celui du paganisme et de l'hétérodoxie, parce qu'il constitue pour elle un véritable problème existentiel.

La présence des Juifs dans l'Empire se différencie également à d'autres égards de celle des payens et des groupes hétérodoxes. Les payens sont des individus qui se définissent en fonction de leurs croyances religieuses, sans pour autant constituer une communauté structurée. En revanche, certaines grandes hérésies se manifestent dans le cadre de communautés caractérisées à la fois par leur spécificité ethnique, culturelle et religieuse: il en est ainsi dans les premiers siècles de Byzance, jusqu'à l'expansion arabe, quand l'Empire comprend la Syrie et l'Égypte, ainsi que plus tard, à la fin du Xe et au XI^e siècle, quand des Syriens et des Arméniens immigrent en territoire byzantin.⁸ Quant aux Juifs, ils ne sont pas

7. Cf. S. G. Wilson, «Melito and Israel», in idem (éd.), *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity, 2. Separation and Polemic*, Waterloo, Ontario, 1986, pp. 81-102; L. Cracco Ruggini, «Pagani, ebrei e cristiani: odio sociologico e odio teologico nel mondo antico», in *Gli Ebrei nell'alto medioevo* [= *Settimane di studio del centro italiano sull'alto medioevo*, XXVI], Spoleto, 1980, I, pp. 48-50.

8. Cf. J. Gouillard, «L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin des origines au XII^e siècle», *TM* 1 (1965), pp. 299-324; G. Dagron, «Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XI^e

seulement considérés comme des individus porteurs d'une tradition religieuse particulière, mais aussi, collectivement, comme une ethnie. C'est ainsi que les Juifs eux-mêmes se perçoivent, et c'est en tant que collectivité ethno-religieuse bien définie, la *natio judaica*, qu'ils sont reconnus dans le cadre de l'État romain depuis Jules César. L'Église reprend cette définition, parce qu'elle convient à la théologie qu'elle développe sur le rôle providentiel des Juifs dans la société chrétienne. Encore faut-il souligner que l'ethnie juive se distingue nettement des autres par un trait singulier: la base territoriale de sa religion, que nous examinerons bientôt.

A priori, il semblerait que la survie du judaïsme et de la communauté juive constitue un défi, puisqu'elle implique la négation même du message chrétien. En réaction, l'Église assigne à l'ethnie religieuse juive le rôle de témoin de la victoire du christianisme: par leur existence même les Juifs, dispersés au sein du peuple chrétien, privés de leur ville sainte, Jérusalem, et de leur indépendance politique, expient collectivement le péché d'avoir renié et crucifié le Christ. Les Juifs doivent donc être dépréciés et humiliés, n'exercer aucun contrôle sur les Chrétiens, être soumis à ceux-ci et vivre dans un régime soulignant leur infériorité. Ainsi fournissent-ils la preuve vivante de leur déchéance et confirment-ils la vérité du message chrétien. Cette conception est clairement exprimée dans la formule d'abjuration récitée par les Juifs qui s'apprêtent au baptême.⁹ Aux yeux de l'Église, les

siècle: l'immigration syrienne», *TM* 6 (1976), pp. 177-216, repr. in idem, *La Romanité chrétienne en Orient. Héritages et mutations*, London, 1984, n° X.

9. Version du début du XI^e siècle, conservée dans une copie de 1027: éd. V. N. Benesevic, «K istorii evreev v Vizantii VI-X vekov» [Sur l'histoire des Juifs à Byzance, VI^e-X^e siècles], *Evreiskaja Mysl'* 2 (1926), Prilozenija, pp. 308-316; trad. et notes in Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 173-180, doc. 121. Au sujet du rituel, cf. G. Dagron, «Le traité de

Juifs constituent donc une composante indispensable de la société, à condition d'être marginalisés en tant que collectivité et en tant qu'individus. Cette véritable idéologie de marginalisation n'est pourtant pas dénuée de paradoxe: alors que l'Église considère la survie de l'ethnie juive jusqu'à la veille du Jugement Dernier comme indispensable à son schéma théologique, elle tente de convertir les membres de cette communauté au christianisme.¹⁰

La particularité du problème posé par l'existence de la communauté ethno-religieuse juive ressort également d'une autre dimension, qui lui est propre: contrairement aux religions payennes ou aux divers courants chrétiens, le judaïsme a des racines territoriales profondes. Jérusalem est à la fois le centre religieux et le centre politique des Juifs jusqu'à sa conquête par les Romains en 70 de l'ère. Après la seconde révolte juive de 132-135 de l'ère, l'empereur Hadrien remplace le nom de Jérusalem par celui d'Aelia Capitolina, et la province de Judée se mue en Syrie-Palestine: par ce geste à la fois politique et symbolique, Rome tente de détruire les attaches territoriales des Juifs et du judaïsme. L'Église est toutefois consciente de leur perennité et tente à son tour de les abolir, pour des raisons théologiques, avec l'appui du pouvoir impérial. Certes, dans la hiérarchie ecclé-

Grégoire de Nicée sur le baptême des Juifs», *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 354-356.

10. Sur les Juifs en tant qu'ethnie dans les écrits ecclésiastiques, cf. G. Dagron, «Judaïser», *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 360-364, et Dagron, «Le traité», pp. 346-353, et *ibid.*, n. 183. Dans les représentations byzantines du Jugement Dernier, les Pharisiens et les douze tribus d'Israel symbolisent l'ethnie juive, alors que les autres condamnés sont des individus. A partir du XVe siècle, les Juifs apparaissent en tête de la procession des peuples damnés: cf. M. Garidis, «La représentation des Nations dans la peinture post-byzantine», *Byzantion* 39 (1969), pp. 86, 90-91; A. Grabar, «La représentation des Peuples dans les images du Jugement Dernier en Europe orientale», *Byzantion* 50 (1980), p. 186.

siastique Jérusalem reste d'abord subordonnée à Césarée maritime, et il faut attendre le concile de Chalcédoine (451) pour qu'elle soit érigée en patriarcat. N'empêche que, dès l'époque de Constantin Ier, l'Église impose son empreinte sur la ville. Elle lui rend son nom ancien, et on assiste au bouleversement et à la restructuration de la géographie sainte de Jérusalem, avec pour corollaire un déplacement des axes religieux à l'intérieur et dans la périphérie de la ville. Ce développement, consciemment voulu par l'Église et les empereurs, est dirigé contre les payens et les Juifs, mais surtout contre ces derniers. Le Saint-Sépulcre est érigé sur l'emplacement des temples payens consacrés à Vénus et Jupiter, après la destruction de ceux-ci. Mais, en outre, l'esplanade du Temple est totalement abandonnée et son état de délabrement à l'époque byzantine symbolise la déchéance du judaïsme. Les grandes constructions exécutées à Jérusalem sur l'initiative d'Hélène, mère de Constantin Ier, et plus tard de Justinien Ier, témoignent de l'importance que ceux-ci attachent à la christianisation de Jérusalem, manifestation du triomphe de leur foi. Eusèbe, évêque de Césarée de 325 à 340 et proche conseiller de l'empereur Constantin Ier, proclame d'ailleurs que Jérusalem a cessé d'être juive à cause du crime de déicide perpétré par les Juifs. Après l'échec en 135 de l'ère de la seconde révolte juive, l'empereur Hadrien interdit aux Juifs la résidence à Jérusalem et l'accès de la ville. Ces interdictions, imparfaitement appliquées puisque le pèlerinage juif continue, sont dictées par des considérations d'ordre politique. Sous l'influence de l'Église le pouvoir byzantin les maintient, mais en vertu de considérations religieuses. L'entrée des Juifs à Jérusalem n'est permise que le 9^e jour du mois juif de Ab, quand selon leur propre calendrier les Juifs pleurent la destruction de leurs deux temples, respectivement par les Babyloniens et par les Romains. La christianisation de Jérusalem se prolonge dans une perspec-

tive eschatologique par la localisation de la deuxième paroisse dans la ville.

Parallèlement à ce développement, nous assistons à la christianisation de la Terre Sainte. Eusèbe de Césarée rédige l'*Onomastikon*, un répertoire des localités mentionnées dans l'Ancien et dans le Nouveau Testament, qui poursuit un but pratique: en identifiant les lieux saints et en précisant la distance qui les sépare, l'ouvrage doit servir de guide aux pèlerins chrétiens visitant la Palestine.¹¹ Mais, au-delà, l'*Onomastikon* s'insère dans le contexte de la confrontation qui oppose l'Église au judaïsme et à la communauté juive. À travers ce qu'on pourrait appeler la «territorialisation» du christianisme, il confère une empreinte proprement chrétienne à la Palestine. Malgré certaines réticences dans le milieu ecclésiastique, la Terre Promise des Juifs se mue en Terre Sainte des Chrétiens. La prise de possession spirituelle des lieux saints du pays, au détriment du judaïsme et des Juifs, représente également une affirmation du triomphe du christianisme. Cette véritable conquête symbolique s'amplifie par une intensification du pèlerinage chrétien et de l'implantation physique sur le terrain, illustrée par le monachisme dans le désert de Judée et surtout par l'édification d'un grand nombre d'églises et de monastères. La campagne de construction se poursuit du IV^e siècle jusqu'à la conquête arabe du VII^e, grâce au financement massif du trésor impérial et à la générosité des fidèles, qu'ils soient Chrétiens de l'étranger, pèlerins ou habitants du pays.¹² L'implantation territoriale

11. Eusebius, *Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen*, éd. E. Klostermann [Die griechischen christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, XI. Eusebius Werke, III/1], Leipzig, 1904. Sur le pèlerinage, cf. E. D. Hunt, *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, A. D. 312-460*, Oxford, 1982.

12. Ce dont témoignent les nombreux vestiges archéologiques découverts pendant les quarante dernières années.

de l'Église a également pour objet la christianisation progressive des populations locales, payenne, samaritaine et juive. Dès l'époque de Théodose II, les Chrétiens sont majoritaires en Palestine. Sur le plan local, la communauté juive est de plus en plus isolée; elle est également affaiblie vers 429 par la perte de ses structures communautaires d'ensemble reconnues par le pouvoir. Mais, au-delà, l'Église vise à déposer les Juifs de leur pays, à les déraciner, à consacrer leur statut d'apatrides, dont le sort, à ses yeux, découle de leur refus de reconnaître la vérité chrétienne. La double démarche de l'Église, à la fois sur le plan symbolique et sur le plan physique, s'insère donc dans un cadre plus vaste, celui du développement de la doctrine de l'Église relative aux Juifs et de la définition de la condition juive dans l'Empire.

Ce développement est étroitement lié au contexte social dans lequel l'Église évolue et auquel elle doit faire face pendant les premiers siècles de son existence: la coexistence des Chrétiens, des payens et des Juifs. L'époque de Constantin Ier constitue un tournant dans son action. Soutenue par le pouvoir impérial, elle se lance dans une vaste activité de propagande, dont le but est double: la conversion des Juifs et des payens au christianisme et, par ailleurs, la création d'un profond clivage religieux et social entre les Chrétiens et les «autres». Le prosélytisme de l'Église, qui constitue un aspect fondamental dans la formation de l'identité chrétienne, se heurte toutefois à deux obstacles: la résistance des Juifs et l'attrait du judaïsme. Faute de pouvoir convertir l'ensemble des Juifs, l'Église est obligée de les affronter, tant sur le plan doctrinal que dans le cadre de la société. Mais, en outre, les payens et les Chrétiens, en particulier des milieux populaires, sont attirés par le judaïsme, ou du moins par certaines de ses croyances et pratiques. Vers la fin du IV^e et au V^e siècle, le phénomène se manifeste en particulier dans la Syrie du Nord, où les communautés juives font preuve

d'une grande vitalité, et conduit à l'éclosion de certaines formes de syncrétisme religieux. A partir de 380 environ, l'Église manifeste une intolérance et une agressivité croissantes contre les Juifs et les «judaïsants», auxquels Jean Chrysostome reproche de fréquenter les synagogues, de participer à des fêtes juives et de s'adresser aux tribunaux juifs. Même s'il n'y a pas eu de prosélytisme juif actif comparable à celui de l'Église, il est indéniable que les communautés juives se sont ouvertes à des adhésions spontanées et ont exercé une pression sur des dépendants, tels que les esclaves. La violence du discours de l'Église est à la mesure des difficultés qu'elle rencontre dans son grand effort d'évangélisation.¹³ Le climat religieux tendu se traduit également par l'extension de la législation impériale concernant les Juifs et par une recrudescence de l'hostilité populaire à leur égard, phénomènes dont il sera question plus loin.

L'identification du judaïsme et des Juifs avec la négation de la foi chrétienne constitue un thème permanent de la polémique et de l'apologétique anti-juives. A partir du Ve siècle, cette identification acquiert également une importance

13. Cf. Cracco Ruggini, «Pagani, ebrei e cristiani», pp. 13-101; J. Lieu, J. North & T. Rajak (éd.), *The Jews among Pagans and Christians in the Roman Empire*, London, 1992, en particulier F. Millar, «The Jews of the Graeco-Roman Diaspora between Paganism and Christianity, AD 312-438», *ibid.*, pp. 112-121, et H. Drijvers, «Syrian Christianity and Judaism», *ibid.*, pp. 138-143; R. L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews. Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, Berkeley 1983; Dagron, «Judaïser», pp. 364-365. Le phénomène de rapprochement, ainsi que le passage de Juifs au christianisme expliquent un processus de transmission dans le domaine des pratiques religieuses: cf. E. Werner *The Sacred Bridge. The Interdependence of Liturgy and Music in Synagogue and Church during the First Millenium*, II, New York, 1984. Les sources juridiques et la littérature chrétienne ne présentent qu'un tableau incomplet et partial de l'affrontement entre les Juifs et l'Église à cette époque.

croissante dans l'offensive de l'Église impériale contre les «judaïsants» et dans la lutte opposant les divers courants chrétiens entre eux. Le «Juif» devient une abstraction, le symbole de l'incroyance, et «judaïser» constitue une tare religieuse, sociale et mentale, qui acquiert également une dimension politique. Les deux termes se transforment en slogans et en insultes, lancés fréquemment à l'encontre d'individus et de groupes sociaux, ethniques ou religieux, accusés d'adhérer au judaïsme, de se soumettre à l'influence des Juifs, d'être associés ou de s'identifier à eux, et de menacer ainsi l'intégrité de la foi et de la société chrétiennes. Le discours ecclésiastique traduit une crainte obsessionnelle de la subversion. Les partisans des diverses tendances christologiques accusent leurs adversaires d'être des Juifs ou des «judaïsants», et il en est de même des iconodoules dans leurs attaques contre les iconoclastes.¹⁴ L'empereur Constantin V (741-745), fervent détracteur des icônes, est qualifié de *ioudaiophron*, et Michel II (820-829) est supposé être favorable aux Juifs et aux sectes hérétiques.¹⁵ Bien que les termes «Juifs» et «judaïsants» soient d'usage courant dans la polémique chrétienne interne, ils marquent les Juifs d'une empreinte résolument négative qui, on le verra plus loin, contribue à leur marginalisation sociale dans l'Empire.

Les développements politiques de la première moitié du VII^e siècle, dont la conquête de Jérusalem par l'Islam, ébranlent dans une certaine mesure la doctrine du triomphe du

14. Exemples dans J. Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, London, 1934, pp. 300-303; pour l'ensemble du sujet, cf. Dagron, «Judaïser», pp. 359-380.

15. Theophanes, *Chronographia*, ed. C. de Boor, Leipzig, 1883-1885, I, p. 404; *Theophanes Continuatus*, ed. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1838, pp. 48-49 (II, 8); J.-B. Chabot (éd. et trad.), *Chronique de Michel le Syrien, patriarche jacobite d'Antioche, 1166-1199*, Paris, 1899-1924, III, p. 72 (XII, 15).

christianisme et de la pérennité de l'Empire, qui constitue un des piliers de l'idéologie byzantine. Si la perte des provinces orientales de Syrie et d'Égypte, peuplées en majorité de communautés ethno-religieuses hétérodoxes, permet enfin l'hellénisation de Byzance, l'unité religieuse de celle-ci n'est pas acquise pour autant. Les réactions de l'Église face aux nouvelles réalités n'affectent pourtant pas son attitude fondamentale à l'égard du judaïsme et des Juifs. La perte de Jérusalem est compensée par la substitution de la Jérusalem céleste à la ville terrestre: elle ne contredit donc pas la christianisation de la ville poursuivie dès le IV^e siècle au détriment des Juifs, manifestation probante de la victoire du christianisme. Dans une veine plus «populaire», le Temple est récupéré au profit de Sainte-Sophie de Constantinople, sensée remplacer l'édifice construit par Salomon.¹⁶ Par ailleurs, la polémique anti-judaïque et anti-juive connaît une recrudescence marquée, mais se situe partiellement dans une perspective nouvelle. Tout en étant dirigée contre les Juifs, accusés de collaboration avec les Perses et, par extension, avec les Arabes, elle vise surtout à sauvegarder dans leur foi les Chrétiens passés sous le joug arabe, désorientés par la parenté supposée des messages religieux de l'Église et de l'Islam, et à empêcher leur défection. Un de ses thèmes majeurs est l'apologie des images chrétiennes et leur défense contre les accusations d'idolatrie formulées par les Juifs, les Musulmans et plus tard les iconoclastes chrétiens. La lutte contre les hérésies «judaïsantes» à l'intérieur de l'Empire

16. Cf. A. Linder, «Ecclesia and Synagoga in the Medieval Myth of Constantine the Great», *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire* 54 (1976), pp. 1024-1040; J. Prawer, «Jerusalem in the Christian and Jewish Perspectives of the Early Middle Ages», in *Gli Ebrei*, II, pp. 750-774; G. Dagron, *Constantinople imaginaire. Études sur le recueil des «Patria»*, Paris, 1984, pp. 300-306: la récupération du Temple atteint son point culminant au IX^e siècle.

constitue le second thème important du discours de l'Église impériale à partir du VII^e siècle. Alors qu'auparavant la tendance «judaïsante» semble avoir été le fait d'individus, dès cette époque elle se manifeste à plusieurs reprises à l'échelle de communautés entières et suscite de sérieuses inquiétudes au sein de l'Église impériale. En réalité, la marginalisation poussée de la communauté juive réduit pratiquement à néant l'attrait que celle-ci peut exercer sur la société chrétienne, et les adhésions individuelles dont elle bénéficie sont peu nombreuses.¹⁷

Alors que l'Église élabore les fondements théologiques et sociaux de la marginalisation juive, l'État institutionnalise celle-ci en la codifiant et en lui fournissant ses structures et ses modalités.¹⁸ Nous nous trouvons ici au croisement de deux conceptions, l'une ecclésiastique, l'autre étatique, et de deux politiques qui en découlent. Bien que celle du pouvoir soit

17. Cf. supra, pp. 110-112, au sujet de Jérusalem; B. Flusin, «Démon et Sarrasins. L'auteur et le propos des *Diègmata stèriktika* d'Anastase le Sinaïte», *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 400-409; A. Cameron, «The Eastern Provinces in the 7th Century A. D. Hellenism and the Emergence of Islam», in S. Said (éd.), *Hellenismos. Quelques jalons pour une histoire de l'identité grecque*, Leiden, 1991, pp. 287-313; V. Déroche, «L'authenticité de l'"Apologie contre les Juifs" de Léontios de Néapolis», *BCH* 110 (1986), pp. 655-669; Gouillard, «L'hérésie dans l'Empire byzantin», pp. 306-312; Dagron, «Judaïser», pp. 359-380.

18. Pour ce qui suit, avec plus de détails, cf. A. M. Rabello, «The Legal Condition of the Jews in the Roman Empire», in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*, herausgegeben von H. Temporini und W. Haase. II, *Principat*, XIII, Berlin-New York, 1972- (en cours), pp. 662-762; Linder, *The Jews*, pp. 67-90; Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 1-26 et 144-147, doc. 83, avec les correspondances entre les Basiliques et les autres textes juridiques byzantins; S. W. Baron, *A Social and Religious History of the Jews*, Second edition, Philadelphia, 1952- (en cours), III, pp. 185-190. Les vues d'ensemble exprimées par ces auteurs doivent être quelque peu nuancées et sont replacées ici dans le contexte général byzantin.

fortement imprégnée des attitudes de l'Église, elle reste fidèle à la tradition juridique romaine et repose également sur des considérations pragmatiques. Nous avons déjà entrevu certains aspects de la législation impériale concernant le judaïsme, la communauté juive et les individus qui la composent. Fait capital, l'État byzantin reconnaît lui aussi l'existence de la collectivité ethno-religieuse juive et assure sa continuité, ainsi que celle du judaïsme. Dans l'Empire romain la religion juive était licite et sa pratique tolérée, bien que la circoncision des non-Juifs et le prosélytisme aient été interdits. Aux II^e et III^e siècles les Juifs jouissent même de ce qu'on pourrait considérer une discrimination positive, puisqu'ils sont dispensés de l'exercice de fonctions publiques portant atteinte à leurs pratiques religieuses. Leur communauté bénéficie d'une autonomie juridique en matière civile et commerciale, peut-être même dans d'autres domaines, sous l'autorité suprême du patriarche juif installé en Palestine et reconnu par Rome, puis par Byzance.

Sous les empereurs chrétiens la pratique du judaïsme reste licite, le culte et les synagogues sont protégés. La communauté juive est reconnue et continue à jouir de son autonomie, le statut de ses chefs étant dans une certaine mesure comparable à celui des prêtres chrétiens. La politique de l'État est cependant ambivalente: si, d'une part, elle tend à préserver la communauté juive, de l'autre elle appuie les efforts de l'Église visant à l'affaiblir. À partir de 380 environ, la législation concernant les Juifs s'étend rapidement et devient plus restrictive et discriminatoire. L'intervention du pouvoir dans la liturgie juive atteint son point culminant avec la Novelle 146 de Justinien I^{er}, promulguée en 553, qui impose l'usage d'une traduction grecque de la Bible s'accordant avec l'exégèse chrétienne.¹⁹ Depuis 398, on assiste

19. Linder, *The Jews*, pp. 402-411; J. Mann, «Changes in the Div-

à une réduction progressive de la juridiction exercée par les juges juifs, limitée en fin de compte aux affaires proprement religieuses et à l'arbitrage en matière civile entre des parties juives. Vers 429 la fonction du patriarche juif, héréditaire, disparaît faute de descendants mâles. L'interdiction de construire de nouvelles synagogues, promulguée en 415, 423 et 438, n'est pas appliquée avec rigueur: ni la vie des anciennes communautés, ni celle de nouveaux groupements créés au cours des siècles suivants n'aurait été possible sans lieux de prière. Par ailleurs, la législation impériale encourage le baptême, interdit le prosélytisme juif et punit sévèrement la conversion au judaïsme. La possession d'esclaves payens ou catéchumènes, menacés par cette conversion, est prohibée. Il est vrai qu'une série de lois dans ce sens, entre 527 et 535, concerne non seulement les Juifs, mais également d'autres groupes sociaux marginalisés, notamment les payens, les hérétiques et les Samaritains. La répétition de ces lois démontre toutefois que la législation concernant les Juifs n'a pas toujours l'effet escompté et que son effet restrictif est parfois sensiblement atténué dans la pratique. Malgré l'attitude ambivalente du pouvoir et l'érosion progressive des prérogatives de la communauté juive, cette dernière jouit paradoxalement d'une condition privilégiée par rapport aux Samaritains, aux payens et aux communautés hétérodoxes, sauf à certaines époques de conversion forcée, que nous examinerons bientôt. C'est d'ailleurs bien ce qu'exprime Elisha bar Shinaya, chef spirituel des Nestoriens de Perse de 1008 à 1046. Il reproche à l'Empire sa mansuétude à l'égard des Juifs: ils sont nombreux, peuvent ouvertement proclamer leur identité, pratiquer le judaïsme et construire des synagogues; ils peuvent

ine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecution», *Hebrew Union College Annual* 4 (1927), pp. 241-282, 301-302.

même entrer dans les églises.²⁰ Bien que cette dernière affirmation soit certainement fausse, le tableau qui se dégage est celui d'une protection et d'une tolérance officielles des Juifs, malgré les restrictions imposées à ces derniers. Établis dès l'époque de Justinien Ier, les paramètres juridiques de leur condition sont maintenus dans l'ensemble, ainsi qu'en témoignent la législation impériale et les recueils juridiques postérieurs. N'empêche que certaines mesures restrictives et vexatoires nouvelles soient introduites plus tard dans des contextes politiques, économiques ou écologiques particuliers.²¹ Soulignons également que la législation impériale de caractère général n'est pas toujours appliquée dans l'ensemble de l'Empire, ni partout de manière uniforme.

Une évolution parallèle se dessine dans la législation impériale concernant l'individu juif et son application pratique. Les Juifs sont citoyens romains de condition libre et, comme les autres citoyens, soumis directement à la juridiction de l'État en vertu de la *Constitutio Antoniana de civitate*, promulguée par Caracalla en 212. Ce principe est maintenu pendant toute l'existence de l'Empire, ainsi qu'en témoigne entre autres le privilège impérial de 1319 en faveur de Ioannina.²² A partir de 380 environ, les Juifs font toutefois l'objet d'une législation discriminatoire et restrictive, qui porte atteinte à leur droits civils et concrétise leur infériorité sociale. On a vu que le prosélytisme leur est interdit, et il en est de même de la polygamie, celle-ci étant contraire aux lois de l'Empire. Aux lois déjà mentionnées on peut ajouter l'ex-

20. Elisha bar Shinaya, *Al-burhan 'ala sahih al-iman*, ms. arabe inédit; trad. L. Horst, *Des Metropolitens Elias von Nisibis Buch vom Beweis der Wahrheit des Glaubens*, Colmar, 1886, pp. 42, 103; cf. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 109-110.

21. Pour les détails, cf. infra, pp. 129-133.

22. *MM*, V, pp. 77-84, en particulier p. 83; cf. Bowman, *The Jews*, pp. 25-26.

clusion de l'armée, de l'administration et des charges publiques à partir du début du Ve siècle. En 531 les Juifs sont disqualifiés en tant que témoins contre des chrétiens orthodoxes, à nouveau dans le cadre de mesures touchant également d'autres groupes marginalisés. À partir du XIe siècle, la liberté de mouvement de certains Juifs est restreinte pour des raisons fiscales, sans que leur condition personnelle en soit affectée.²³ La législation impériale limite la socialisation entre Juifs et Chrétiens, parce qu'elle risque de favoriser la propagation de croyances et de pratiques juives, de perturber la foi des Chrétiens, sujet d'une anxiété permanente et profonde au sein de l'Église, et de troubler ainsi la paix sociale.

L'examen des divers domaines dans lesquels se manifeste la présence et l'intervention de l'État fait ressortir que, dans l'ensemble, le pouvoir impérial adopte une attitude à forte coloration ecclésiastique, empreinte d'hostilité à l'égard des Juifs, mais pragmatique.²⁴ Les sources législatives ne rapportent toutefois pas tous les aspects de l'abaissement social des Juifs imposé par l'État. Il en est ainsi de la ségrégation résidentielle, examinée plus loin. Diverses mesures impériales illustrent un profond mépris envers les Juifs et une volonté délibérée de manifester publiquement leur dépréciation sociale. Le voyageur Benjamin de Tudèle, qui visite Byzance vers 1160, rapporte que le médecin de l'empereur Manuel Ier Comnène est le seul Juif autorisé à circuler à cheval.²⁵ Une formule de serment imposée aux Juifs antérieurement à 1148 implique la reconnaissance de la spécificité juive,

23. Détails *infra*, pp. 128-129.

24. On en verra d'autres exemples plus loin.

25. M. N. Adler (éd. et trad.), *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela* London, 1907 [ci-après: *BT*], texte hébraïque, p. 16; trad. anglaise, p. 14.

mais est nettement injurieuse dans les paroles comme dans le cérémonial qui les accompagne.²⁶ Des Juifs sont contraints de servir de bourreaux dans des circonstances particulières: ainsi en 1073, quand Michel VII Doukas leur ordonne d'aveugler l'ex-empereur Romanos IV, et à nouveau en 1296, quand le général Philanthropenos subit un sort identique.²⁷ En 1185 Andronic Ier Comnène fait empaler Andronic Doukas, parent et garant d'Isaac Comnène qui tient Chypre, dans le cimetière juif situé à Péra.²⁸ Dans ces trois cas isolés, l'association de l'élément juif aux peines infligées vise également à humilier profondément les victimes.

A première vue, on aurait pu s'attendre à des attitudes concordantes et, par conséquent, à une action concertée de l'Église et de l'État face aux Juifs. Il en est généralement ainsi à partir du IV^e siècle. N'empêche qu'il existe parfois des divergences profondes entre l'Église et les empereurs. Le zèle religieux excessif de certains ecclésiastiques suscite à l'échelle locale des émeutes et des attaques à main armée contre les synagogues et les Juifs eux-mêmes, ou encore provoque la fuite ou l'expulsion de ces derniers, comme à An-

26. Cf. E. Patlagean, «Contribution juridique à l'histoire des Juifs dans la Méditerranée médiévale: les formules grecques de serment», *Revue des études juives* 4e série, 4 (1965), pp. 138-139, 143-147, repr. in eadem, *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance*, London, 1981, n° XI.

27. Michael Attaleiates, *Historia*, éd. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1853, p. 178, qui se réfère au Juif en tant que «descendant de déicide»; Georgios Pachymeres, *De Andronico Palaeologo*, éd. I. Bekker, Bonn, 1835, pp. 228-229.

28. I. A. Van Dieten (éd.), *Nicetae Choniatae historia* (CFHB, XI/1), Berlin-New York, 1975, p. 294. Pour la localisation du cimetière, cf. D. Jacoby, «Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine», *Byzantion* 37 (1967), p. 177, repr. in idem, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine*, London, 1975, n° II, où il y a lieu de corriger les détails de la mort de Doukas.

tioche au Ve siècle, à Sparte vers 985 et à Chonae vers 1150.²⁹ De leur côté, les empereurs se considèrent les garants de la légalité romaine et de la paix publique et, du moins jusqu'à la fin du règne de Théodose II, réagissent aux manifestations anti-juives, même au prix de mesures à l'encontre des Chrétiens. Leur politique pragmatique dans ces circonstances est également dictée en partie par la crainte d'une agitation ou d'une insurrection des Juifs, dont les communautés bien structurées à l'intérieur de l'Empire sont présumées jouir de l'appui des Juifs de Perse, la solidarité juive transgressant les frontières politiques. En conséquence, la politique des premiers empereurs se situe parfois nettement en retrait par rapport à celle de l'Église, bien que celle-ci exerce une pression constante sur le pouvoir. Ainsi en 423 Théodose II veut-il rendre aux Juifs d'Antioche leur synagogue, détruite par les Chrétiens, mais finalement renonce à cette mesure devant la violente opposition de Syméon le Stylite.³⁰

Cependant, par la suite, le zèle des empereurs dépasse à certaines périodes celui de l'Église et le pouvoir exerce la contrainte afin d'obtenir la conversion des Juifs au christianisme. Les recours à cette mesure extrême semblent parfois constituer une réaction à l'attitude des Juifs; dans l'ensemble, ils sont cependant motivés par des considérations religieuses et politiques plus générales, qui ne sont pas toujours le fruit d'une politique rationnelle. Il existe des cas isolés de conversion forcée, de caractère local, comme à Borion, en Cy-

29. Cf. *infra*, respectivement pp. 123 et 143-144, 147, 149.

30. Sur cette *Realpolitik*, cf. B. S. Bachrach, «The Jewish Community of the Later Roman Empire as Seen in the *Codex Theodosianus*», in J. Neusner - E. S. Frerichs (éd.), «*To See Ourselves as Others See Us*». *Christians, Jews, «Others» in Late Antiquity*, Chico, California, 1985, pp. 399-421; Wilken, *John Chrysostom*, pp. 52-54; A. M. Rabello, «La première loi de Théodose II, C. Th. XVI, 8, 18, et la fête de Pourim», *Revue historique de droit français et étranger* 55 (1977), p. 555.

rénaïque, où la mesure semble liée à la résistance acharnée de la population locale, dont les Juifs, lors de la conquête byzantine sous Justinien Ier.³¹ La première tentative systématique de baptême forcé à l'échelle de l'Empire intervient près d'un siècle plus tard, en 630-632. L'empereur Héraclius, ébranlé par l'occupation passagère de Jérusalem par les Perses, veut affirmer la victoire du christianisme dans une lutte historique et apocalyptique contre les mécréants, assurer l'unité politique et la cohésion sociale de l'Empire et éliminer une fois pour toutes la communauté juive, qui a tenté de reconstituer son centre religieux et de regagner son autonomie territoriale avec l'appui des Perses.³² Sous Léon III, en 721-722, l'initiative impériale s'insère dans le cadre d'une politique générale visant à renforcer l'unité religieuse de Byzance: les Juifs ainsi que les membres des sectes «dualistes» et «judaïsantes», fortement ancrées en Asie Mineure, ont à choisir entre le baptême et l'exil. En 873-874, quand Basile Ier tente à son tour de convertir les Juifs, en particulier ceux de la capitale et des grandes villes, semble-t-il, c'est dans le contexte d'une poussée économique et peut-être en rapport avec l'adoption du judaïsme par certains milieux dans le royaume des Khazars. Afin de promouvoir sa politique de baptême, il soumet les Juifs à une forte pression, tout en leur promettant de l'argent, des exemptions fiscales et une promotion sociale. Son fils Léon VI va plus loin: après son accession au pouvoir en 886, il promulgue une loi interdisant

31. Procopius Caesarensis, *Opera omnia, Περὶ κτισμάτων libri VI, sive De Aedificiis* (Biblioteca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum Teubneriana), VI, 2, ed. J. Haury, Lipsiae, 1913, p. 175.

32. Sur le cadre et le climat eschatologique de l'époque, cf. G. Dagron et V. Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens dans l'Orient du VII^e siècle», *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 18-34, 37-43, 263-267, et note suivante; C. Laga, «Judaism and Jews in Maximus Confessor's Works. Theoretical Controversy and Practical Attitude», *Bsl* 51 (1990), pp. 183-188.

aux Juifs baptisés sous Basile Ier la pratique du judaïsme, dans laquelle la plupart d'entre eux persistent secrètement.³³ La persécution religieuse sous Romain Ier Lécapène, amorcée vers 930, s'étend non seulement aux Juifs, mais aussi aux Arméniens et aux prisonniers musulmans. De nombreux Juifs opposés au baptême semblent toutefois être autorisés à quitter l'Empire et se réfugient dans le royaume des Khazars. Le baptême forcé est imposé pour la dernière fois en 1254, par Théodore II Laskaris, empereur de Nicée, la mesure étant révoquée cinq ans plus tard par Michel VIII Paléologue après son accession au pouvoir.³⁴ Ces persécutions tranchent nettement sur la politique générale de tolérance religieuse à l'égard des Juifs de l'Empire.

L'Église considère le baptême un rite d'initiation individuel et spontané. C'est pourquoi la politique impériale de conversion forcée appliquée aux Juifs suscite en son sein de fortes résistances. Celles-ci s'appuient à la fois sur une attitude doctrinale, des décisions conciliaires et des considérations pragmatiques, dont la crainte que les Juifs baptisés sous la contrainte ne profitent de leurs rapports suivis avec les Chrétiens pour faire du prosélytisme. Ces considérations sont illustrées par une lettre de St. Maxime, rédigée après le baptême forcé des Juifs d'Afrique en 632, par le canon 8 du deuxième concile de Nicée, réuni en 787, ainsi que par Grégoire Asbestas dans son *Traité sur le baptême des Juifs*, datant vraisemblablement de 878-879. Asbestas s'élève contre le baptême massif ordonné par Basile Ier, qui est anticanonique; on ne peut d'ailleurs pas faire confiance aux Juifs, dont la conversion n'est pas sincère parce qu'ils voient dans celle-ci le moyen d'améliorer leur condition matérielle et sociale.³⁵

33. Cf. Dagron et Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens», pp. 43-45; Dagron, «Le traité», pp. 348-349.

34. Cf. Starr, *The Jews*, p. 7; Bowman, *The Jews*, pp. 17-19.

35. Cf. R. Devreesse «La fin inédite d'une lettre de saint Maxime:

En outre, à partir du IX^e siècle, certains milieux ecclésiastiques s'opposent à une intervention du pouvoir temporel dans un domaine considéré comme étant du ressort exclusif de l'Église.³⁶ L'essentiel pour notre propos est cependant ailleurs. Les conversions forcées sont rares, de courte durée et se soldent par des échecs, la grande majorité des Juifs revenant ouvertement au judaïsme après les persécutions, sans pour autant encourir les peines prévues par la loi.³⁷ N'empêche que ces tentatives avortées de baptême laissent des traces profondes au niveau des réactions ecclésiastiques et contribuent à la formation de l'image du Juif dans la mentalité populaire byzantine, dont il sera question plus loin. Avant d'aborder ce domaine, il y a lieu de vérifier les divers aspects de la marginalisation dans la vie quotidienne des Juifs de l'Empire.

La fondation de diverses communautés juives d'Anatolie,

un baptême forcé de Juifs et de Samaritains à Carthage en 632», *Revue des sciences religieuses* 17 (1937), pp. 131-135, et le texte de Grégoire Asbestas dans Dagron, «Le traité», p. 319, § 3; sur cet auteur et la date de son traité, *ibid.*, pp. 340-347, 352. Entraîné par sa polémique contre Basile I^{er}, Asbestas trace un tableau excessif des mesures prises par l'empereur en faveur des Juifs baptisés, qu'il faut se garder de prendre à la lettre. Il est en effet invraisemblable que des tanneurs juifs ayant quitté leur métier aient bénéficié de dignités impériales. Si celles-ci ont jamais été octroyées, ce serait tout au plus à quelques chefs de communautés, dans le but d'entraîner les membres de celles-ci au baptême. Le témoignage tardif attribué à Constantin VII Porphyrogénète pourrait bien s'appuyer sur des polémistes tel qu'Asbestas, et il n'est donc pas sûr qu'il constitue une source indépendante confirmant les dires de ce dernier.

36. Cf. Dagron, «Le traité», pp. 353-357.

37. C'est le cas après la conversion sous Basile I^{er}: cf. N. Oikonomides, «La brebis égarée et retrouvée: l'apostat et son retour», in *Religiöse Devianz. Untersuchungen zu sozialen, rechtlichen und theologischen Reaktionen auf religiöse Abweichungen im westlichen und östlichen Mittelalter*, herausgegeben von D. Simon, Frankfurt am Main, 1990, p. 147.

de Grèce, dont celle de Thessalonique, de Chypre et de Rhodes remonte à l'époque pré-chrétienne; celle de Constantinople existe depuis l'époque de Théodose II au plus tard, alors que les groupements juifs d'Italie méridionale remontent au IV^e siècle de l'ère, sinon plus tôt. Il n'est guère possible de retracer l'évolution de l'implantation juive dans l'Empire: l'état fragmentaire de la documentation voue toute tentative de ce genre à l'échec. Cependant, trois phénomènes sautent aux yeux: la continuité de la présence juive dans l'Empire, bien qu'elle ne se manifeste pas toujours sur le plan local,³⁸ le large déploiement géographique des communautés juives et l'existence d'un flot migratoire juif continu dans l'espace byzantin.³⁹ Dans l'ensemble, il n'existe aucune entrave à la liberté de mouvement des Juifs, que ce soit à l'intérieur de l'Empire ou à ses frontières, ni à leur établissement provisoire ou permanent dans son cadre.⁴⁰ C'est bien ce que révèlent, entre autres, les documents de la Gueniza du Caire. Aux XI^e et XII^e siècles des courants migratoires relient les communautés juives de Byzance avec celles de l'Égypte et d'autres pays de l'Islam. La migration juive à partir de l'Égypte vers Byzance et à l'intérieur de l'Empire au XI^e siècle est illustrée par un cas individuel, fort significatif, qui mérite d'être

38. Dans diverses villes de l'empire romain cette présence remonte à une époque antérieure à Constantin I^{er} et contribue de manière décisive à la création des premières communautés chrétiennes.

39. Cf. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 107-162, mais l'existence de petites communautés dispersées (pp. 145-146) n'a aucun rapport avec les incursions des Croisés et des Normands; E. Malamut, *Les îles de l'Empire byzantin, VIIe-XIIe siècles*, Paris, 1988, I, pp. 165-170; Bowman, *The Jews*, pp. 49-96; sur Chio, cf. infra.

40. Notons cependant une tradition monastique slave, selon laquelle l'empereur (Alexis I^{er} Comnène?) aurait expulsé les Juifs de Cherson à cause des méfaits commis par certains d'entre eux et parce qu'ils possédaient des esclaves, à l'encontre de la législation impériale: cf. Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 9, 209-211, doc. 155.

signalé. Un Juif égyptien s'installe vers 1065 en Anatolie, mais, comme beaucoup d'autres habitants de la région, prend la fuite vers l'ouest après la défaite byzantine de Mantzikert en 1071; il finit par s'établir à Thessalonique.⁴¹ Dès la fin du XIVe siècle on assiste à l'arrivée de Juifs d'Espagne en Roumanie; leur migration massive ne commence toutefois qu'en 1492.⁴²

La migration du Juif égyptien du XIe siècle que nous venons d'évoquer est plus ou moins contemporaine d'un chrysobulle impérial délivré en 1062 par Constantin X Doukas en faveur du monastère de la Néa Monè de Chio. Dans cet acte, l'empereur confirme le transfert de quinze familles juives au monastère, effectué par Constantin IX Monomaque en 1049, et étend la concession à leurs descendants; il réaffirme que ces Juifs remettront au monastère une taxe généralement payée au fisc impérial; enfin, il interdit l'installation d'immigrants juifs dans l'île. On en a conclu que les Juifs de Chio sont attachés à la terre et ont le statut de parèques; en outre, que l'empereur limite leur liberté et celle des Juifs d'autres localités. Selon certains, cet acte illustrerait l'existence d'entraves au mouvement des Juifs dans l'ensemble de l'Empire. En réalité, le problème traité est uniquement d'ordre fiscal, de caractère local et sans aucune portée générale. Les mesures restrictives de 1062 visent, d'une part, à

41. Cf. S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967-1988, I, pp. 49, 52-53, 57-58, et V, pp. 438-443; idem, «The Jewish Communities of Saloniki and Thebes in Ancient Documents from the Cairo Geniza», *Sefunot, Annual for Research on the Jewish Communities in the East* 11 (1967), pp. 11-12 [en hébreu, avec résumé anglais]; ce Juif ne s'établit pas provisoirement à Constantinople, comme l'auteur semble le suggérer. Cf. également Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 110-112, 119.

42. Cf. Jacoby, «Les quartiers juifs», pp. 213-214.

garantir au monastère les revenus provenant des Juifs de Chio en maintenant ceux-ci et leurs descendants dans l'île et, par ailleurs, à préserver les intérêts du fisc impérial, puisque de nouveaux résidents juifs risquent d'être assimilés par le monastère aux Juifs déjà installés à Chio.⁴³ Près d'un siècle plus tard, vers 1160, Benjamin de Tudèle avance le chiffre de 400 Juifs pour Chio.⁴⁴ Même s'il s'agit d'individus, l'augmentation considérable de la population juive de l'île ne peut pas s'expliquer uniquement par la natalité et suppose une immigration libre, peut-être encouragée par des conditions économiques locales particulièrement favorables. Il est en tout cas évident que les restrictions imposées à l'immigration à Chio en 1062 ont cessé d'être observées bien avant la visite du voyageur juif. La « possession » de trois Juifs de Ioannina par l'église métropolitaine de la ville, confirmée par l'empereur Andronic II en 1321, découle également de considérations fiscales.⁴⁵ Elle garantit à cette institution certains revenus, sans pour autant soustraire les Juifs concernés par cette mesure à la juridiction impériale ou les subordonner soit à des individus, soit à des communautés ecclésiastiques.

Ceci nous amène au problème de l'habitat juif. Sauf en Palestine pendant les premiers siècles de Byzance, la majorité des Juifs de l'Empire sont des citadins. L'existence de quartiers juifs particuliers ne fait pas de doute. La concentration spatiale spontanée d'un groupe ethnique ou religieux

43. Cf. Ph. P. Argenti, *The Religious Minorities of Chios. Jews and Roman Catholics*, Cambridge, 1970, pp. 63-92, qui résume également les opinions antérieures, et mon compte-rendu négatif de ses pages dans *BZ* 66 (1973), pp. 108-109.

44. *BT*, p. 17; trad. p. 14. Ce chiffre élevé serait-il dû à l'erreur d'un copiste, ou reflète-t-il une réalité? La question ne peut pas être tranchée.

45. *MM*, V, pp. 84-87, en particulier p. 86; cf. Bowman, *The Jews*, pp. 26-27.

minoritaire dans le cadre de l'espace urbain est un phénomène courant: elle renforce la solidarité sociale et religieuse et répond aux besoins psychiques de ses membres. Ce phénomène s'expliquerait donc aisément dans le cas particulier des Juifs, d'autant plus qu'ils constituent une communauté marginalisée dans l'Empire. Il faut cependant également envisager une ségrégation imposée par les autorités impériales. Des quartiers juifs sont attestés en Italie méridionale, à Oria au milieu du IX^e siècle et à Bari en 1051, sans qu'on puisse déterminer s'il sont nés de groupements spontanés ou de la contrainte.⁴⁶ Il en est de même à Chalkoprateia, le «marché du cuivre», quartier de Constantinople situé à l'ouest de l'emplacement sur lequel s'élèvera plus tard l'église Sainte-Sophie. Ce quartier est habité par des Juifs, peut-être dès l'époque de Théodose II, sinon avant.⁴⁷ Nous sommes mieux

46. A Oria, *porta hebraica*: «De S. Barsanuphio Solitario», in *Acta Sanctorum*, Aril II, 26; le quartier juif de Bari est signalé dans l'«Anonymi Barensis Chronicon», du XII^e siècle, in Muratori, *Rerum italicarum scriptores*, V, p. 151, et en tant que *judeca* peu après la conquête normande, dans un acte considéré comme un faux, mais basé sur une charte authentique: L.- R. Ménager, *Recueil des actes des ducs normands d'Italie (1046-1127). I, Les premiers ducs (1046-1087)*, Bari, 1980, p. 143, n° 44. Un quartier juif entouré d'un mur existe à Attaleia en 1331-1332: Ibn Batoutah, *Voyages*, éd. et trad. C. Defrémery et B. R. Sanguinetti, Paris, 1853-1859, II, pp. 258-259. Selon Starr, *The Jews*, p. 44, il pourrait remonter à l'époque byzantine, mais comme les marchands latins et les Grecs habitent également leur quartier respectif délimité par une enceinte, il faut croire que ce régime urbain est postérieur à la conquête seldjuqide de 1207. Sur l'isolement des marchands latins en pays musulman, cf. D. Jacoby, «Les Italiens en Égypte aux XII^e et XIII^e siècles: du comptoir à la colonie?», in M. Balard et A. Ducellier (éd.), *Méthodes d'expansion et techniques de domination dans le monde méditerranéen (XI^eme-XVI^eme siècles)*, Paris, 1994 [sous presse].

47. Cf. Th. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolinarum*, Leipzig, 1901-1907, II, pp. 226-227, § 32; R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*

informés pour une période postérieure.⁴⁸ Au XI^e siècle, les Juifs résident tous le long de la Corne d'Or, dans la région réservée aux marchands étrangers, où ils sont soumis au même régime restrictif que ces derniers. Leur groupement obligatoire dans une région urbaine déterminée rappelle en particulier celui des marchands musulmans, parce que dans ces deux cas précis la ségrégation frappe des communautés religieuses non-chrétiennes. Selon toute vraisemblance, en 1044 les Juifs installés dans la *Ébraikè* de la ville sont transférés dans le quartier de Péra, de l'autre côté de la Corne d'Or, où ils vivent groupés à l'écart de la population grecque jusqu'à l'incendie de leur quartier en 1203. A partir du règne de Michel VIII Paléologue, on retrouve les Juifs à Constantinople même, cette fois dans le quartier de Vlanga, situé sur la Propontide, où leur résidence est déterminée par les autorités impériales. Fait significatif, le quartier juif est entouré d'un mur d'enceinte doté de portes, qu'on ferme chaque soir. La ségrégation sociale est donc accentuée par un rempart matériel, qui a également une portée symbolique. A proprement parler, il s'agit d'un ghetto, et il en est de même du quartier réservé aux Musulmans. Mais alors que ceux-ci sont des étrangers, les Juifs de Vlanga sont des sujets byzantins, parmi lesquels figurent de nombreux tanneurs. L'isolement de ces artisans dans le cadre ou à l'extérieur de l'espace urbain est une mesure fréquemment adoptée par les autorités locales au moyen âge. L'installation des Juifs à Vlanga, au bord de la mer, loin des quartiers les plus peuplés de Constantinople, semble répondre à des considérations

tique de l'Empire byzantin. Première partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique. Tome III: Les églises et les monastères, 2^e éd., Paris, 1969, pp. 237-242; A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinopouleos* (Poikila Byzantina, 8), Bonn, 1988, pp. 411-414; Jacoby, «Les quartiers juifs», pp. 168-169.

48. Pour ce qui suit, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 169-205, 220-221.

écologiques.⁴⁹ Nous verrons bientôt l'apport de ce facteur à la marginalisation juive.

La politique impériale de concentration et de ségrégation résidentielles appliquée aux Juifs de Constantinople est documentée au cours de quatre siècles. Elle s'insère dans une politique d'ensemble, dictée par la méfiance à l'égard des «autres». Que ce soit pour des raisons politiques, économiques ou religieuses, les sujets étrangers et en général tous ceux qui ne sont pas d'obédience orthodoxe sont isolés afin d'être mieux surveillés. Des troubles à Constantinople, attribuées à l'afflux d'Arméniens, d'Arabes et de Juifs, donc de membres de trois groupes ethno-religieux, induisent Constantin IX à expulser en 1044 tous les étrangers installés dans la ville pendant les trente dernières années.⁵⁰ Les mêmes groupes sont visés entre 1230 et 1234 par Démétrios Chômatianos, métropolite d'Ohrid, et par le patriarche de Constantinople Athanase Ier en 1305-1306.⁵¹ Le premier d'entre eux affirme que les étrangers de langue ou de religion, tels que les Juifs, les Arméniens et les Musulmans ont obtenu depuis longtemps la permission d'habiter les pays des Chrétiens, à condition de vivre séparés. Ils ne peuvent construire leurs maisons de prières que dans les quartiers restreints qui leur sont réservés. La composante religieuse de cette politique se retrouve au

49. Analogie frappante avec Dermata, le quartier des Juifs de Candie situé hors de l'enceinte urbaine au XIII^e siècle et remontant par conséquent à l'époque byzantine.

50. En réalité les «Arabes» sont des Musulmans dont l'origine varie, mais qui néanmoins constituent un groupe ethno-religieux aux yeux des Byzantins.

51. Cf. Jacoby, «Les quartiers juifs», pp. 181-182; A.-M. Maffry Talbot (éd. et trad.), *The Correspondence of Athanasius I, Patriarch of Constantinople* (CFHB, VII), Washington, D. C., 1975, pp. 52, 329-331 (n° 23); pp. 76, 345 (n° 36); pp. 82 et 84, 348-350 (n° 41). Ce prélat demande l'éviction totale des Juifs et des Arméniens de la capitale.

XIIe siècle à Thessalonique, où l'archevêque Eustathe se plaint de l'extension de la résidence juive au-delà des limites prescrites. Le principe de l'isolement résidentiel des Juifs semble donc valable pour tout l'Empire depuis un temps reculé, mais, faute de sources, nous ignorons depuis quand ou dans quelle mesure il est strictement appliqué hors de Constantinople.⁵² Notons que dans cette ville les Juifs sont les seuls sujets de l'Empire à être soumis à cette ségrégation collective, qui acquiert par conséquent un caractère nettement discriminatoire et vexatoire. C'est d'ailleurs ainsi que les Juifs eux-mêmes la perçoivent.⁵³

Y a-t-il eu limitation ou discrimination des Juifs dans le domaine économique? En dépit des restrictions qui leur sont imposées sur le plan légal et social, les Juifs participent pleinement à la vie économique de l'Empire. Leur possession ou détention de biens fonciers et de biens meubles est documentée tout au long de l'histoire de Byzance.⁵⁴ Après la perte de la Palestine au VIIe siècle, on rencontre rarement des paysans juifs dans l'Empire: c'est pourtant le cas, fort probablement, dans les Pouilles dans la première moitié du IXe siècle et dans le voisinage de Krisa, en Béotie, vers 1160.⁵⁵ Leur présence dans la capitale, les carrefours routiers, les centres industriels, les ports et les îles est liée à leur activité dans l'artisanat et le commerce. Les artisans juifs jouent un rôle important dans les industries textiles, en particulier celle de la soie à Thèbes, Constantinople et Thessalonique au XIIe siècle: ils travaillent dans le tissage, la broderie et la confection d'habits. On constate leur grande concentration dans

52. C'est également le cas pour l'isolement des marchands étrangers dans les villes provinciales.

53. Nous y reviendrons plus loin.

54. Starr, *The Jews*, p. 27; la seule restriction concerne un terrain sur lequel une église est située.

55. Ibid., pp. 27-28; *BT*, p. 12, et trad. p. 10.

la teinture de la soie et d'autres textiles, ainsi que dans le traitement des peaux et des fourrures. On a évoqué, à ce propos, une marginalisation professionnelle, puisque la teinture et la tannerie étaient considérées comme des occupations avilissantes et situaient les artisans qui les pratiquaient au bas de l'échelle sociale; en d'autres termes, les Juifs auraient été contraints d'exercer ces occupations, afin de manifester et d'accentuer publiquement la dépréciation de leur condition. Cette hypothèse s'avère sans fondement. La pratique de la teinture et du tannage est fort répandue parmi les Juifs sur le pourtour de la Méditerranée médiévale, dans l'Empire byzantin, en Occident et dans les pays islamiques, soit dans des régions dont le régime social est fort varié; en outre, à Byzance on trouve également des teinturiers et des tanneurs chrétiens; enfin, on peut évoquer le large éventail des occupations poursuivies parallèlement par les Juifs.⁵⁶ La stratification sociale et économique de la communauté juive de Constantinople vers 1160, évoquée par le voyageur juif Benjamin de Tudèle, présente une certaine analogie avec celle de la «bourgeoisie» chrétienne de la capitale à la même époque.⁵⁷

Les Juifs de l'Empire participent également au commerce local et maritime, ainsi qu'à celui de l'argent. Il existe deux témoignages pour la première moitié du VII^e siècle. La *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati* se réfère à l'activité de marchands et d'agents juifs entre Constantinople et Carthage, voire jusqu'en Espagne et en Gaule.⁵⁸ Selon la légende de Théodore et d'Abraham, le Juif accorde un prêt à un marchand grec

56. Cf. Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 29, 136-138, doc. 74; Dagron, «Le traité», pp. 350-352.

57. *BT*, pp. 16-17; trad. p. 14.

58. *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*, éd. et trad. V. Déroche, in *TM* 11 (1991), pp. 213-219 (V, 19-20); cf. également Dagron et Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens», pp. 235, 237-240, et pour la datation de ce texte, pp. 246-247.

propriétaire de navire.⁵⁹ Les documents de la Gueniza du Caire mentionnent le trafic entre Byzance et l'Égypte aux XI^e et XII^e siècles.⁶⁰ Enfin, les comptes du marchand vénitien Giacomo Badoer, rédigés à Constantinople de 1436 à 1440, font état de Juifs aux noms et surnoms grecs, sans qu'on puisse déterminer s'ils sont de nationalité byzantine; il en est de même d'un prêteur juif actif dans la ville vers 1400.⁶¹ Pourtant, à deux reprises au cours du Xe siècle, les Juifs impliqués dans le commerce sont frappés d'exclusion. Le *Livre de l'Éparque*, dont une copie du Xe siècle est préservée, réglemente diverses activités industrielles et commerciales dans la capitale et énonce des règles, dont certaines étaient sans nul doute en vigueur auparavant. Afin d'assurer un ravitaillement abondant en matières premières à l'industrie de la soie de Constantinople, les autorités interdisent la vente de la soie grège importée dans la ville «à des Juifs ou à des marchands», susceptibles de la revendre à l'extérieur.⁶² Contrairement aux marchands, les Juifs sont définis dans ce contexte par leur appartenance à un groupe ethno-religieux, et non par leur activité économique. S'agit-il de discrimina-

59. M. Hoferer (éd.), *Ioannis Monachi Liber de Miraculis*, Würzburg, 1884, pp. 7-41; cf. B. Nelson and J. Starr, «The Legend of the Divine Surety and the Jewish Moneylender», *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 7 (1939-1944), pp. 289-304, avec liste des manuscrits p. 293, n. 1.

60. Cf. supra, n. 41.

61. U. Dorini e T. Bertelè (éd.), *Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli 1436-1440)*, Roma, 1956; cf. Jacoby, «Les quartiers juifs», pp. 212-213; *MM*, II, pp. 313-314, doc. DXXX, et cf. N. Oikonomidès, *Hommes d'affaires grecs et latins à Constantinople (XIII^e-XV^e siècles)*, Montréal-Paris, 1979, p. 58. Pour d'autres sources, cf. mon compte-rendu signalé supra, n. 3, p. 404.

62. J. Koder (éd. et trad.), *Das Eparchenbuch des Leons des Weisen. Einführung, Edition, Übersetzung und Indices (CFHB, XXXII)*, Wien, 1991, p. 100, VI, 16, et pour la date présumée, pp. 20-41.

tion? On l'a avancé, compte tenu de la politique de conversion massive imposée aux Juifs vers la même époque par les premiers empereurs de la dynastie macédonienne et la méfiance de ceux-ci à l'égard des néophytes.⁶³ Il semble toutefois que la réponse réside ailleurs. Il faut mettre l'interdiction en rapport avec l'activité des marchands juifs appelés Radhanites, dont le commerce et les itinéraires sont décrits par le maître de poste bagdadien Ibn Khurdadhbeh dans un traité de géographie composé en 846-847 et complété vers 885. Entre autres langues les Radhanites parlent le grec, et à leur retour d'Extrême-Orient certains d'entre eux passent par Constantinople avant de poursuivre leur voyage vers l'Occident. L'ouvrage d'un autre auteur persan, Ibn al-Faqih, rédigé vers 903, subsiste uniquement dans une version abrégée: il ne se réfère qu'à la connaissance du grec, mais on peut supposer à bon droit que la version originale reprenait les propos d'Ibn Khurdadhbeh au sujet des Radhanites. Il est donc vraisemblable que l'activité de ces derniers se poursuit à Constantinople au début du Xe siècle, soit peu de temps avant l'exécution de la copie de 912 du *Livre de l'Éparque*, et que ces marchands y achètent la soie grège, soit directement aux métaxoprates, soit à des intermédiaires locaux familiarisés avec le marché de la capitale et actifs dans la contrebande.⁶⁴

63. Cf. R. S. Lopez, «Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire», *Speculum* 20 (1945), pp. 23-24, et cf. supra, pp. 124-125.

64. Ibn Khordadhbeh, *Kitab al-Masalik wa'l-mamalik (Liber viarum et regnorum)*, éd. et trad. M. J. de Goeje, Lugduni-Batavorum, 1889, pp. 153-154, et trad. pp. 114-115; Ibn al-Fakih al-Hamadhani, *Compendium libri Kitab al-Boldan*, éd. M. J. de Goeje, Lugduni-Batavorum, 1885, p. 270. Sur ces deux ouvrages et les Radhanites, cf. T. Lewicki, «Les commerçants juifs dans l'Orient islamique non méditerranéen au IXe-XIe siècle», in *Gli Ebrei*, I, pp. 381-383. Le rapport avec les Radhanites a déjà été suggéré par Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 19, 33, qui ne connaissait toutefois pas le second texte. Pour plus de détails, cf. mon

Cette mesure est donc dictée uniquement par des considérations économiques, mais les rapports étroits entre les Radhanites et leurs coreligionnaires byzantins conduisent les autorités à mentionner explicitement ces derniers aux côtés des autres marchands. Le second cas d'exclusion apparaît dans un chrysobulle délivré en 992 aux Vénitiens, auxquels les empereurs Basile II et Constantin VIII confirment certains avantages fiscaux, commerciaux et juridiques. L'acte spécifie entre autres que les Amalfitains, les Juifs et les Lombards ou Latins de Bari et d'ailleurs voyageant à bord des navires vénitiens ne jouiront pas des privilèges octroyés aux Vénitiens; en revanche, les Grecs d'Italie méridionale ne sont pas compris dans cette énumération. Voilà qui implique qu'à l'exception des Vénitiens, la restriction vise l'ensemble des non-orthodoxes, y compris les Juifs, que l'Empire soumet au régime des étrangers visitant la capitale, bien que certains d'entre eux résident dans sa province d'Italie.⁶⁵ A nouveau, il n'est pas question de discrimination économique dirigée spécifiquement contre les Juifs.

On ne pourrait guère retracer le processus de marginalisation des Juifs de l'Empire sans tenir compte d'un facteur qui a souvent exercé une influence plus puissante que les attitudes de l'Église et de l'État à leur égard, les mesures discriminatoires et vexatoires imposées par ces institutions, ou encore les réalités quotidiennes: l'image des Juifs aux yeux de la société chrétienne de l'Empire. En effet, la marginalisation sociale se traduit, entre autres, dans la perception de la minorité élaborée par la société majoritaire, ainsi que

étude «Silk Economics in Tenth Century Constantinople» [en voie de préparation].

65. Ed. A. Pertusi, «Venezia e Bisanzio nel secolo XI», in *La Venezia del Mille* [= *Storia della civiltà veneziana*, X], Firenze, 1965, pp. 155-160.

dans les tournures d'esprit et les réflexes émotifs et psychiques que cette perception suscite. Celle-ci s'articule à plusieurs niveaux. Il y a d'abord le reflet de la réalité objective, empirique, perçu grâce au contact direct avec les Juifs. Le particularisme de ces derniers, exprimé par leur appartenance religieuse, leur cohésion sociale, leur tendance spontanée à vivre groupés et leur mode de vie, renforce l'écart social entre eux et leurs voisins chrétiens. L'altérité perçue ou supposée est génératrice de soupçons, d'inquiétudes, de craintes et de jalousies. Elle contribue à la généralisation abusive de caractéristiques particulières observées chez certains Juifs ou qui leur sont attribuées, ou encore à la transformation de l'ensemble des Juifs en symbole et personnification de l'incroyance et d'une opposition fondamentale au christianisme. Le Juif, au singulier, devient une abstraction.⁶⁶ Cette deuxième étape dépeint sur des stéréotypes sociaux partiels et négatifs, de nature xénophobe; dans le cas particulier des Juifs, la démarche engendre un glissement de l'anti-judaïsme vers l'antisémitisme, deux attitudes différentes qu'il faut se garder de confondre, mais qui s'identifient souvent dans l'Empire. Au-delà, dans un troisième temps, se situent l'imaginaire et les phantasmes collectifs: avec la déshumanisation et la démonisation des Juifs, nous entrons dans le domaine du subconscient.⁶⁷

Le milieu ecclésiastique joue un rôle déterminant dans

66. Nous l'avons déjà constaté: cf. supra, pp. 114-115.

67. Je m'appuie ici sur l'analyse suggestive de G. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, Los Angeles, 1990, pp. 311-352, et en particulier pp. 326-340. Cf. aussi M. Lazar, «The Lamb and the Scapegoat: the Dehumanization of the Jews in Medieval Propaganda Imagery», in S. L. Gilman and S. T. Katz (éd.), *Antisemitism in Times of Crisis*, New York, 1991, pp. 38-80, dont le traitement de la démonisation dans les premiers siècles chrétiens est utile, mais insuffisant; cette étude couvre surtout l'Occident.

l'élaboration de l'image du Juif dans l'Empire. Ce processus, qui commence avant même l'époque de Constantin Ier, est étroitement lié aux préoccupations théologiques de l'Église et à son combat contre le judaïsme et les Juifs, les «judaïsants» et les hétérodoxes. La représentation du Juif s'exprime en premier lieu dans un système doctrinal bien structuré, formulé dans le cadre des conciles et des écrits théologiques, ainsi que dans la rhétorique anti-judaïque et anti-juive des grands codes législatifs. Formulée dans un langage savant, qui n'est pleinement accessible qu'aux lettrés, elle est diffusée à des fins didactiques à tous les échelons de la société byzantine par la prédication, les récits hagiographiques et la littérature polémique. Cette démarche poursuit un but précis: discréditer le judaïsme aux yeux des Chrétiens, afin de valoriser la doctrine et les pratiques de l'Église et, à cet effet, déshumaniser et démoniser le Juif.⁶⁸ D'emblée, l'Église s'engage dans le portrait collectif et la généralisation abusive. En effet, une des composantes majeures de son image du Juif est le crime de déicide, imputé à l'ensemble des Juifs à partir de l'époque de la crucifixion.⁶⁹ Ce crime, ainsi que le refus de la vérité chrétienne et de la rédemption dans l'au-delà illustrent la nature différente des Juifs et leur infériorité par rapport aux croyants. La pratique ouverte du judaïsme

68. Notons que l'Église adopte la même démarche face à l'Islam: cf. Flusin, «Démon et Sarrasins», pp. 400-409.

69. Cf. supra, p. 108. La permanence du thème dans le discours ecclésiastique est illustrée par le patriarche Athanase Ier, vers 1305, in Maffry Talbot, *The Correspondence*, p. 82 (n° 41), et p. 349. L'importance du crime aux yeux de l'Église ressort indirectement d'un récit apocryphe de Michel le Syrien, dirigé contre les Chalcédoniens. Afin de se moquer des Chrétiens, les Juifs auraient affiché sur la voie publique, après le concile de Chalcédoine, un écrit demandant leur absolution du crime de déicide en arguant que leurs pères n'avaient attenté qu'à la nature humaine du Christ: *Chronique de Michel le Syrien* (cf. supra, n. 15), II, p. 91 (VIII, 12).

par les Juifs ou clandestine par les Juifs baptisés de force, ainsi que l'incapacité des uns et des autres à la conversion sincère suppose l'entêtement, la duplicité, la perfidie et la collusion avec les démons, qui siègent dans les âmes et les synagogues des Juifs. C'est pourquoi l'adoption du judaïsme par un Chrétien ne s'explique que par l'intervention de Satan. Les caractéristiques psychologiques des Juifs les marquent forcément en tant qu'éléments subversifs et menaçants, adonnés aux pratiques secrètes et conspirant à troubler la sérénité et la paix de la société chrétienne.⁷⁰ Ces traits se retrouvent dans le rituel d'abjuration imposé aux Juifs baptisés au début du XI^e siècle et conservé dans une copie de 1027,⁷¹ qui ne fait donc que reprendre des vues courantes depuis la haute époque byzantine.

Le portrait collectif des Juifs de Byzance tracé par le milieu ecclésiastique ne se limite pas à leur psychologie; il s'étend également à leur caractère moral et à leur comportement. Au IV^e siècle Jean Chrysostome accuse les Juifs d'extravagance, de gloutonnerie et de débauche.⁷² Il est suivi par Anastase le Sinaïte, dont les *Érôtapocriseis* ou «Questions et Réponses» sont rédigées dans les années 690.⁷³ La question 94 de ce recueil aborde la question de savoir pourquoi il y a plus de malades chroniques et d'infirmes chez les Chrétiens que chez les incroyants. La question reflète manifestement

70. Jean Chrysostome, *Adversus Iudaeos orationes*, I, § 6, et VIII, § 8, in *PG*, XLVIII, col. 852-853, 940. Sur les «judaïsants» et la démonologie, cf. Dagron, «Judaïser», pp. 371-376, et Dagron et Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens», pp. 261, 263. En tant que jeune homme, le héros de la *Doctrina Jacobi* agit de manière à attiser la haine et la dissension au sein de la population chrétienne: cf. *ibid.*, pp. 235-237.

71. Cf. Benesevic, «K istorii evreev», en particulier p. 312; cf. aussi *supra*, n. 9.

72. Jean Chrysostome, *Adversus Iudaeos orationes*, I, § 4, in *PG*, XLVIII, col. 848.

73. Datation par Flusin, «Démons et Sarrasins», pp. 390-396, 409.

une préoccupation réelle, largement répandue à tous les échelons de la société byzantine, au sujet de la validité de la foi chrétienne. La réponse d'Anastase le Sinaïte se réfère à l'influence comparée du climat, de la race et du régime alimentaire dans l'apparition des maladies. Le propos est illustré par les Juifs qui, s'adonnent plus que d'autres aux plaisirs de la table et consomment beaucoup de viandes, de sauces et de vins, mais, en raison du climat désertique de leur pays d'origine et de la constitution sèche de leur race, souffrent moins de la goutte et d'autres maladies.⁷⁴ Cette réponse se veut rationnelle, puisque fondée sur la science médicale. Mais, en outre, elle sous-entend un double stéréotype social, qui justifie et avive l'animosité des couches populaires et confirme leurs préjugés à l'égard des Juifs. Elle attribue collectivement aux Juifs non seulement la gloutonnerie, comportement contraire à l'idéal de mesure et d'harmonie prôné par l'Église, mais implique aussi que les Juifs peuvent s'adonner à leurs plaisirs de table parce qu'ils sont plus aisés que les Chrétiens.⁷⁵

La distortion de préceptes religieux juifs en vices est un des procédés favoris employés dans le milieu ecclésiastique pour la création de stéréotypes anti-juifs, qui rejoignent les conceptions populaires. Pour Anastase le Sinaïte, les Juifs ne s'abstiennent pas de manger du porc parce que l'animal est impur, mais à cause de leur appât du gain. Ils préfèrent manger les animaux qui leur rapportent également d'autres bénéfices, tels que des oeufs, du lait, du fromage ou de la

74. PG, LXXXIX, col. 732-733; G. Dagron, «Le saint, le savant, l'astrologue. Étude de thèmes hagiographiques à travers quelques recueils de "Questions et réponses" des Ve-VIIe siècles», in *Hagiographie, cultures et sociétés (IVe-VIIe s.)*, *Études Augustiniennes*, Paris, 1981, pp. 144-145, repr. in idem, *La Romanité chrétienne*, n° IV.

75. Grégoire Asbestos accuse lui-aussi les Juifs d'hédonisme: cf. Dagron, «Le traité», p. 354.

laine, alors que le porc ne contribue que sa propre chair.⁷⁶ Le même raisonnement est utilisé dans la vie anonyme de St. Constantin, rédigée par un moine au début du Xe siècle. Elle traite d'un Juif de Synnada, en Phrygie, converti au christianisme près d'un demi siècle plus tôt. Après la mort de sa mère, les parents du jeune homme veulent le marier parce que, selon la coutume des Juifs, il n'y a pas d'acte plus honorable et vertueux que de s'adonner à la chair et de procréer.⁷⁷ L'hagiographe est manifestement conscient de l'importance attachée par la tradition juive au précepte biblique «multipliez-vous» (Genèse, I. 28), mais, dans une perspective monastique, le déforme à dessein en vice juif.

Le milieu ecclésiastique établit également les caractéristiques physiques des Juifs, manifestation concrète et visible de leur infériorité morale. Dans son *Traité sur le baptême des Juifs*, déjà mentionné plus haut, Grégoire Asbestas affirme que le Juif baptisé de force reste «attaché aux vanités judaïques, tannant son cuir, tout souillé de crottes de chiens et de vomissures de toutes sortes»⁷⁸. L'allusion au métier de tanneur est évidente. Notons à ce propos qu'on utilisait à Constantinople les crottes de chien pour la teinture des cuirs et la préparation des parchemins. Ailleurs dans son traité l'auteur emprunte à l'Évangile selon St. Mathieu (VII, 6) les paroles du Christ: «Ne donnez pas aux chiens ce qui est saint et ne jetez pas vos perles aux cochons», qu'il y a lieu de rapprocher du passage cité ci-dessus. Au-delà de son sens littéral, ce dernier implique une généralisation évidente, le métier de tanneur devenant synonyme de Juif et la religion

76. PG, LXXXIX, col. 1271.

77. *Acta Sanctorum*, Novembre, IV, pp. 630-631, Appendix, *Vita Constantini*, § 8; Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 119-121, doc. 54.

78. Texte dans Dagron, «Le traité», p. 319, § 3, lignes 6-8, trad. avec commentaire du passage, p. 318.

juive synonyme de saleté et de souillure. Le même rapprochement se retrouve dans le «Jugement Dernier» de la *Vie de St. Basile le Jeune*, oeuvre de la première moitié du Xe siècle: les Juifs sont d'une saleté repoussante, avec «un visage qui semble enduit d'un mélange de pus et de crottes de chien», et même Moïse vient injurier leur communauté sale et puante.⁷⁹ De son côté, le métropolite d'Athènes Michel Choniate loue Niketas, métropolite de Chonai, qui vers 1150 a chassé les Juifs de la ville, qui ont été contraints d'aller ailleurs «comme des chiens affamés rongant leur cuir, pour exercer leur métier de tanneurs et de teinturiers».⁸⁰ Il ne manque pas d'ajouter un jeu de mots à propos du judaïsme: ainsi Niketas les a-t-il empêché de contaminer l'habit du Christ en le teignant de leur blasphème.⁸¹ Peu après 1296, l'humaniste Maximos Planoudes associe lui-aussi le judaïsme à l'odeur de la tannerie.⁸²

Compte tenu du rôle de l'Église dans la vie de la société byzantine, il n'est guère surprenant que la déshumanisation et la démonisation des Juifs, élaborée dans le milieu ecclésiastique, ait marqué les esprits et ait engendré des fantasmes collectifs au niveau de la mentalité populaire. La prédisposition psychologique explique la crédulité manifestée par la population chrétienne de la région d'Antioche à l'égard de l'accusation de meurtre rituel, lancée en 415 à l'encontre

79. Trad. Dagron, «Le traité», p. 319, n. 30; cf. idem, «Judaïser», p. 374.

80. Trad. Dagron, «Le traité», p. 351, et cf. Addendum.

81. Michael Choniates, ed. Sp. P. Lampros, *Μιχαήλ Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τὰ σωζόμενα*, Ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1879-1880, I, p. 53; pour la date de l'eulogie, vers 1200, cf. G. Stadtmüller, «Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen (ca. 1138-ca. 1222)», *Orientalia Christiana*, XXXIII/2, n° 91 (1934), p. 118.

82. M. Treu (éd.), *Maximi monachi Planudis epistulae*, Breslau, 1890, pp. 51-52, n° 31.

des Juifs d'Inmestar. Les Juifs de cette localité, où des émeutes les opposent aux Chrétiens, sont supposés avoir crucifié un enfant chrétien, tout en se moquant du christianisme au cours d'une de leurs fêtes.⁸³ Il s'agit manifestement de celle de Pourim, qui commémore par des manifestations joyeuses la défaite du ministre Hamman, exécuté sur l'ordre du roi Assuérus pour avoir voulu exterminer les Juifs de Perse; l'épisode est rapporté par le *Livre d'Esther*. Alors que le récit biblique parle de pendaison, une loi édictée par Théodose II en 408, soit quelques années à peine avant les événements d'Inmestar, révèle que les Juifs de l'Empire brûlent l'effigie de Hamman, fixée sur une croix. Cette crucifixion est mentionnée dans la Vulgate, oeuvre rédigée vers 400 sous le règne du même empereur, dans laquelle St. Jérôme se base à plusieurs reprises sur une exégèse juive de la Bible;⁸⁴ elle est également rapportée par des sources juives postérieures. La coutume semble remonter à l'époque pré-byzantine et présente une analogie avec le *mimus*, la caricature du Christ représentée par les payens aux II^e et III^e siècles. Elle a visiblement survécu pendant plusieurs siècles, malgré son interdiction par Théodose II, puisqu'elle apparaît au début du XI^e siècle dans la formule d'abjuration des Juifs avant leur baptême.⁸⁵

La crucifixion symbolique d'une effigie, brûlée ensuite, constitue une expression virulente de l'hostilité des Juifs à l'égard du christianisme. Elle engendre du côté chrétien l'accusation de meurtre d'un enfant symbolisant Jésus, qui se situe dans le prolongement direct du crime collectif de déi-

83. Pour ce qui suit, cf. Linder, *The Jews*, pp. 236-238, doc. 36; Rabello, «La première loi de Théodose II», pp. 545-556, en particulier p. 552, n. 25; Dagron, «Judaïser», pp. 364-365.

84. Cf. J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome. His Life, Writings and Controversies*, London, 1975, pp. 134, 141-167.

85. Benesevic, «K istorii evreev», p. 311.

cide, imputé aux Juifs, et trahit une grande anxiété quant à la véracité du message chrétien.⁸⁶ Cette accusation est vraisemblablement formulée dans le milieu ecclésiastique, à une époque et dans une région où l'Église craint l'attrait du judaïsme et de la communauté juive et où la tension entre Juifs et Chrétiens est parfois particulièrement vive.⁸⁷ Elle a sans nul doute pour but de mettre fin au comportement «judaïsant» de certains Chrétiens et d'approfondir le clivage social entre Juifs et Chrétiens. Le thème du meurtre rituel figure plus tard dans une tradition monastique slave, selon laquelle un Juif de Cherson aurait crucifié St. Eustratios et l'aurait percé d'une lance avant la Pâque juive vers la fin du XI^e siècle.⁸⁸

La grande controverse des images engendre un autre type d'accusations contre les Juifs, considérés par les iconodoules comme les instigateurs de la politique poursuivie par leurs adversaires: les Juifs se moquent des icônes, les profanent ou les détruisent; parfois ils les attaquent brutalement et les font saigner. Tel est le cas de l'icône du Christ conservée au Saint Puits de Sainte-Sophie, qu'un Juif aurait poignardée.⁸⁹ Le Juif figurant dans ce type de récits renouvelle et perpétue le déicide qui est à l'origine de sa déchéance. Aux yeux de la société chrétienne byzantine, l'énormité de son crime marque de manière permanente l'ensemble de sa communauté, bien que lui-même finisse par se faire baptiser,

86. L'analyse du meurtre rituel imputé aux Juifs en Occident, proposée par Langmuir, *Towards a Definition of Antisemitism*, pp. 209-236, est également valable pour Byzance.

87. Cf. supra, pp. 113-114, 123.

88. Cf. supra, n. 40.

89. La tradition est rapportée par un texte tardif: cf. K. N. Ciggaar, «Une description de Constantinople traduite par un pèlerin anglais», *REB* 34 (1976), pp. 248-249. Pour d'autres récits, cf. Parkes, *The Conflict*, pp. 292-293.

grâce à l'intervention divine. Son méfait se transforme ainsi en démonstration éclatante de la vérité chrétienne.⁹⁰ Le sang versé du Christ vient rassurer la foi vacillante de ceux qui doutent de la puissance miraculeuse des icônes et éprouvent un certain trouble quant à la réalité de la Passion. Le culte des icônes en est rehaussé.

Les écrits ecclésiastiques byzantins offrent quelques rares portraits de «bons» Juifs. En accordant un prêt à Théodore, Abraham se montre plus généreux que les amis du marchand chrétien; des Juifs admirent la souffrance et la piété chrétiennes, et le patriarche de Constantinople Athanase Ier s'exclame que même les Juifs verseraient des larmes en voyant la détresse de ceux qui sont démunis à cause des agissements des agents fiscaux, des Turcs et des Italiens.⁹¹ Cependant, vu de près, ces références apparemment flatteuses ont un but bien précis: elles annoncent la conversion des Juifs concernés, soulignent la supériorité de la foi chrétienne ou font ressortir l'ignominie des mauvais Chrétiens, dont le comportement est violemment condamné. Le portrait positif du Juif n'illustre donc pas une approche plus nuancée, individuelle, ni l'abandon des généralisations abusives. Il s'insère dans un schéma général d'éducation religieuse et morale du peuple chrétien.

Jusqu'ici nous avons examiné les divers aspects de la marginalisation sociale institutionnalisée et l'image collective stéréotypée des Juifs, élaborée principalement dans le milieu ecclésiastique. Sur ces facteurs se greffent les doutes et les anxiétés profondes de la société chrétienne, projetées sur les Juifs. Quel est l'impact de ces éléments sur le comportement

90. Cf. Langmuir, *Towards a Definition of Antisemitism*, pp. 263-281, sur les Juifs d'Occident accusés d'attaquer les hosties.

91. Cf. supra, pp. 134-135; Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church*, p. 306; Maffry Talbot, *The Correspondence*, p. 96 (n° 46).

de la société laïque chrétienne et sur la mentalité populaire en général? Les témoignages semblent contradictoires. Il existe une dimension locale et quotidienne de coexistence, de socialisation et de coopération économique entre Juifs et Chrétiens; encore faut-il en circonscrire soigneusement la nature et les limites. A la haute époque byzantine, on trouve entre eux des contacts suivis et parfois intenses, comme à Antioche, que l'Église et l'État réprouvent et tentent d'entraver.⁹² La participation des Juifs aux émeutes des factions de cirque constitue une forme de socialisation avec les Chrétiens. Par ailleurs, l'intolérance et l'hostilité populaires, alimentées par l'Église, font parfois irruption sous forme de manifestations violentes. Les émeutes et les persécutions dirigées contre les Juifs, les baptêmes forcés et les expulsions à l'échelle locale sont plutôt rares et de courte durée. Ces initiatives locales ne sont d'ailleurs pas toujours appuyées par l'ensemble de la population chrétienne: on le constate à Sparte vers 985.⁹³ Dans la première moitié du VIIe siècle, la légende de Théodore et Abraham rapporte que ces deux personnages s'accordent entre eux, mais, en revanche, les amis chrétiens du marchand refusent de se porter garants du prêt accordé par un Juif.⁹⁴ Nous ne savons pas si les artisans juifs travaillant dans les industries textiles à Sparte au IXe et à Thèbes au XIIe siècle ont leurs propres ateliers, ou s'ils travaillent de concert avec les artisans chrétiens. Leur intégration dans le circuit de production industrielle exige en tout cas une étroite coopération entre les uns et les autres. Il n'est guère possible de savoir si les Juifs

92. Cf. supra, pp. 113-114, 145.

93. D. F. Sullivan (éd. et trad.), *The Life of Saint Nikon*, Brookline, Mass., 1987, pp. 110-125, §§ 37-39. La *vita* date vraisemblablement du milieu du XIe siècle.

94. Cf. supra, n. 59.

sont membres des corporations byzantines, contrôlées par l'État. Il est en tout cas certain qu'ils ne participent pas aux fonctions religieuses exercées par ces institutions.⁹⁵ Sur la foi d'une formule de serment juif, attestée en 1148,⁹⁶ on a suggéré l'existence de corporations juives à Constantinople; on n'en trouve cependant aucune trace directe.⁹⁷ Certes, les rapports sociaux et la coopération dans le domaine économique rapprochent certains Juifs de leurs voisins chrétiens. Le contact suivi avec les médecins juifs, qui soignent les Chrétiens de toutes les strates sociales, jusqu'aux empereurs,⁹⁸ a le même effet. Cette socialisation entre individus reste toutefois limitée et n'altère ni la vision et la perception des Juifs reflétées par la mentalité populaire, ni les attitudes collectives fondamentales de la société byzantine chrétienne à leur égard. Benjamin de Tudèle en témoigne pour Constantinople.⁹⁹

Dès les premiers siècles de Byzance, ces attitudes sont empreintes d'une hostilité latente à tous les niveaux de la société chrétienne byzantine. En conséquence, les Juifs sont

95. Sur les fonctions religieuses des corporations, cf. S. Vryonis, Jr., «Byzantine ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century», *DOP* 17 (1963), pp. 297-300, 302 et n. 47, 303-305, repr. in idem, *Byzantium: its Internal History and Relations with the Muslim World*, London, 1971, n° III.

96. Cf. Patlagean, «Contribution juridique à l'histoire des Juifs», pp. 139-140, 143-147.

97. La survie des corporations à Constantinople au XII^e siècle a donné lieu à de vives controverses. Sur l'ensemble du sujet, en rapport avec l'industrie de la soie, cf. mon étude «Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade», *BZ* 84-85 (1991-1992) [sous presse].

98. Pour Justin II: P. van de Ven (éd. et trad.), *La vie ancienne de S. Siméon Stylite le Jeune*, Bruxelles, 1962-1970, I, p. 179, § 208 (texte); II, pp. 204-206 (trad.); le médecin est qualifié de serviteur des démons, adonné à la sorcellerie. Pour Manuel I^{er}, cf. supra, p. 121.

99. Cf. infra, p. 150.

particulièrement vulnérables et susceptibles d'être soumis aux pressions, tracasseries et exactions des officiers impériaux, ainsi qu'à celles de la population ambiante, malgré la protection de l'État. Sous le règne d'Héraclius, Jacob risque d'être «appréhendé et malmené comme Juif» en Afrique, et c'est pourquoi son patron constantinopolitain lui remet un sauf-conduit.¹⁰⁰ Benjamin de Tudèle souligne vers 1160 que le médecin juif de Manuel Ier Comnène intervient auprès de l'empereur en faveur de sa communauté.¹⁰¹ Sous le règne d'Andronic II, les Juifs s'assurent la protection de Kokalas, dignitaire de la cour impériale, grâce à des pots-de-vin.¹⁰² L'ambiance populaire peut être illustrée par de nombreux exemples. Parmi ceux-ci on peut citer les émeutes anti-juives, comme celles d'Inmestar en 415, ou le ralliement du gros de la population de Sparte à l'expulsion des Juifs, exigée par St. Nikon vers 985. Selon le Nestorien Elisha de Nisibe, auteur de la première moitié du XI^e siècle, les Juifs «endurent l'humiliation et la haine» de la population chrétienne de Byzance.¹⁰³ Une lettre relatant les espoirs messianiques des communautés juives de l'Empire, rédigée en 1096, souligne qu'à Thessalonique les Chrétiens ont toujours haï les Juifs intensément, et ceux-ci craignent d'être massacrés par leurs voisins.¹⁰⁴ Un pamphlet anonyme intitulé *Anacharsis* ou *Ananias*, rédigé probablement peu après 1158, exprime dans une veine satirique le mépris et l'animosité de la société laïque à l'égard des Juifs.¹⁰⁵ Afin de prouver ses connais-

100. *Doctrina Jacobi*, p. 215 (V, 20, lignes 5-6), et Dagron et Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens», p. 239.

101. Cf. supra, n. 25.

102. Cf. Maffry Talbot, *The Correspondence*, p. 82 (n° 41), et p. 349.

103. Cf. supra, n. 20.

104. Trad. Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 203-208, doc. 153.

105. D. A. Chrestides, *Μαρκιανὰ ἀνέκδοτα. Ἀνάχαρις ἢ Ἀνανίας. 2. * Ἐπιστολές-Σιγίλλιο, Θεσσαλονίκη*, pp. 259-260, 264-265, 271, 283. *

sances linguistiques, le poète contemporain Jean Tzetzes rapporte la manière dont il s'adresse à des étrangers: alors qu'il adopte un langage courtois envers les Latins, les Russes et les Arabes, il salue les Juifs avec des invectives faisant allusion à leurs pratiques magiques et les maudit.¹⁰⁶ Un tableau éloquent est tracé par Benjamin de Tudèle, qui vers la même époque visite Péra, quartier à population mixte, les Juifs y étant toutefois séparés des Grecs. Il affirme que c'est à cause des tanneurs juifs, qui déversent dans la rue les eaux sales et nauséabondes provenant du traitement des peaux, que les Grecs haïssent, oppriment et rouent de coups en public tous les Juifs, sans distinction aucune.¹⁰⁷ Notons toutefois qu'à Byzance, contrairement à l'Occident à partir du XI^e siècle, on ne trouve pas d'assimilation entre Juif et usurier. Dans le cadre de l'économie monétaire byzantine, dont l'existence est continue, le prêt à intérêt constitue un * instrument indispensable que les consiles de l'Église ne condamnent pas, comme en Occident. Par conséquent, dans l'Empire le prêt à intérêt reste licite dans la limite des taux prescrits par l'État, il est pleinement pratiqué par les Chrétiens et ne constitue pas un secteur de l'économie dans lequel les Juifs jouent un rôle important.¹⁰⁸

106. Ed. H. Hunger, «Zum Epilog der Theogonie des Johannes Tzetzes», in idem, *Byzantinische Grundlagenforschung*, London, 1973, n° XVIII, pp. 304-305; sur la signification exacte du texte «hébraïque», cf. H. and R. Kahane, «Christian and un-Christian Etymologies», *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964), pp. 28-33, repr. in H. and R. Kahane, * *Graeca et Romanica Scripta Selecta*, I, Amsterdam, 1979, n° 37.

107. Cf. supra, n. 57.

108. Angeliki Laiou, «God and Mammon: Credit, Trade, Profit and the Canonists» in N. Oikonomides (éd.), *Tò Βυζάντιο κατὰ τὸν 12ο αἰῶνα. Κανονικὸ Δίκαιο, κράτος καὶ κοινωνία*, Ἀθήνα, 1991, pp. 261-300. Les Juifs ne sont pas mentionnés dans les écrits polémiques traitant de l'usure. Pour un exemple du XIV^e siècle, cf. R. Guiland, «Le traité

En réalité, les propos de Benjamin de Tudèle illustrent parfaitement le processus mental décrit plus haut. Dans une première phase, il y a identification de la saleté et de la puanteur avec les artisans juifs qui en sont responsables et, dans la seconde, avec l'ensemble des Juifs en tant que tels, quelle que soit leur occupation. On assiste donc à un glissement de la réalité objective, spécifique et individuelle au stéréotype collectif xénophobe et antisémite, qui se confondent. Ce processus est facilité et encouragé par les préjugés et la haine à l'encontre des Juifs, cultivés par le milieu ecclésiastique et dont la société laïque est fortement imprégnée. Il s'avère d'ailleurs que la tannerie, ainsi que la teinture reflètent dans une certaine mesure les attitudes des divers secteurs de la société byzantine à l'égard du judaïsme et des Juifs. L'approche du pouvoir impérial, en rapport avec la résidence des Juifs à Constantinople, découle partiellement de considérations pragmatiques générales, telles que l'écologie. Celle du milieu ecclésiastique, de caractère didactique et de nature agressive, assimile le judaïsme à la tannerie et les Juifs à des occupations considérées comme avilissantes et, au moyen d'analogies grossières et d'un langage acerbe, crée des stéréotypes collectifs négatifs. Ceux-ci ne manquent pas de filtrer à travers les strates de la société byzantine et de s'incruster dans la mentalité populaire, où ils rejoignent les stéréotypes courants concernant les Juifs.

La vie culturelle des Juifs byzantins, profondément liée à leur vie religieuse, évolue en rapport étroit avec celle des centres rabbiniques de Palestine et de Babylonie.¹⁰⁹ Elle se

inédit 'Sur l'usure' de Nicolas Cabasilas», in *Εἰς μνήμην Σπυρίδωνος Δάμπρου*, 'Εν 'Αθήναις, 1935, pp. 269-277.

109. Pour ce qui suit, cf. Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 65-79; Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry*, pp. 178-181; Z. Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium. The*

distingue toutefois par certains traits originaux de celle des groupements juifs établis dans les pays de l'Islam ou de la Chrétienté occidentale. Les Juifs de Byzance, appelés «Romanioles» vers la fin du moyen âge («Romania» étant synonyme de Byzance), ainsi que les immigrants qui s'installent dans l'Empire subissent l'influence du milieu ambiant. Ils parlent le grec, non seulement avec leurs voisins chrétiens, mais également entre eux, et des mots grecs parsèment leur correspondance.¹¹⁰ Les livres d'exégèse biblique et les traités doctrinaux des Karaïtes, membres d'une secte juive née en terre d'Islam et établis dans l'Empire à partir du Xe siècle, révèlent une certaine connaissance de la société, de la philosophie et de la langue grecque. Les Juifs byzantins développent également leur propre liturgie et coutume, qui comprend la lecture de traductions grecques de la Bible dans les synagogues, introduite parce que les fidèles préfèrent la langue courante à l'hébreu biblique littéraire, qu'ils comprennent mal; c'est dans ce cadre que se place l'intervention de Justinien Ier en 553.¹¹¹ Ils rédigent des glossaires hébraïques-grecs pour faciliter l'étude de la Bible et de la Michnah. En outre, de nombreux Juifs byzantins portent des noms ou surnoms grecs. Ces traits distinctifs se maintiennent dans les communautés romaniotes passées sous domination occidentale après la IVe croisade, comme en Crète, ou sous le joug turc. Dans l'Empire, le processus acculturatif est surtout d'ordre linguistique, au niveau du quotidien, et ne suffit

Formative Years, 970-1100, New York - Jerusalem, 1959, en particulier pp. 193-200; Bowman, *The Jews*, pp. 129-170, en particulier pp. 164-170.

110. Comme les surnoms d'origine géographique se transmettent, Salomon l'Égyptien, médecin juif de Manuel Ier Comnène, n'est pas nécessairement un nouvel immigrant. Sa fonction exigeait évidemment la connaissance du grec.

111. Cf. *supra*, p. 118.

pas à rompre les barrières sociales entre Juifs et Chrétiens. Il n'engendre pas une symbiose judéo-grecque.

Il reste à percevoir et à évaluer brièvement la marginalisation telle qu'elle est vécue subjectivement par les Juifs byzantins eux-mêmes. Quatre types de manifestations sociales la révèlent: l'observation directe de la réalité, la réaction face à la pression sociale et psychologique de la société chrétienne, les écrits et mouvements eschatologiques, enfin, la conversion. Il a déjà été question des propos de Benjamin de Tudèle sur les sévices infligés aux Juifs de Constantinople, dont il rapporte les sentiments: «ils se trouvent dans un dur exil». ¹¹² La crucifixion de Hamman, à Inmestar et ailleurs, est manifestement un réflexe intériorisé d'auto-défense d'une communauté durement agressée par le milieu ambiant. Les espoirs eschatologiques des Juifs de Palestine à l'époque de l'expansion perse et celle des Arabes au VIIe siècle, ainsi que le mouvement messianique qui bouleverse les communautés juives des provinces balkaniques à l'époque de la première croisade reflètent l'amertume face aux réalités, ainsi que l'espoir d'une libération prochaine du joug chrétien et du retour vers la Terre Promise. ¹¹³ La pression constante exercée par la société ambiante, d'une part, le désir d'assimilation à la majorité et de promotion sociale, de l'autre, engendrent la défection de certains individus, pressurés à se faire baptiser ou acceptant volontairement la conversion. Tel n'est cependant pas le cas de la plupart des Juifs. Le repli collectif sur soi-même, réflexe d'une minorité marginalisée et assiégée, mais farouchement déterminée à assurer sa survie, se traduit par la solidarité du groupe et le maintien de sa

112. *BT*, p. 16; la traduction anglaise, p. 14, manque de précision.

113. Cf. Dagron et Déroche, «Juifs et Chrétiens», pp. 41-42, 264-265; Starr, *The Jews*, pp. 203-208, doc. 153.

tradition ethno-religieuse tout au long de l'histoire plus que millénaire de Byzance.

En définitive, dans l'Empire byzantin, état chrétien, l'allégeance religieuse constitue le critère primordial de différenciation et de stratification sociales. Le Juif n'est pas marginalisé à la suite d'une atteinte au corps social, de la violation du code moral ou parce qu'il est affligé d'un mal physique ou mental. Il est marginalisé d'office, dès sa naissance. Par la suite, il reste cloisonné dans sa propre communauté, qui constitue le cadre social exclusif dans lequel il évolue. Il ne peut guère s'intégrer à la communauté majoritaire et jouir d'une promotion sociale au sein de celle-ci, à moins de renier sa propre identité religieuse, ethnique et culturelle, accepter le baptême et, par extension, partager les valeurs et les attitudes de la majorité. Il doit donc s'arracher au corps social auquel il appartient, mais, dès ce moment, il cesse d'être juif.

ADDENDUM

Suite de la n° 80: P. Magdalino, «Enlightment and Repression in Twelfth-Century Byzantium. The Evidence of the Canonists», N. Oikonomides (éd.), *Tò Βυζάντιο κατὰ τὸν 12ο αἰώνα. Κανονικὸ Δίκαιο, κράτος καὶ κοινωνία*, Ἀθήνα 1991, p. 368, sur la foi d'une interprétation erronée du texte, suggère qu'il y aurait eu une expulsion générale des Juifs des villes de l'Empire, dont Chonai. Les sources du milieu du XIIe siècle concernant les communautés juives contredisent clairement cette hypothèse et font ressortir le caractère local des événements.

IV

The Jews of Constantinople and their demographic hinterland

Migration played an important role in Constantinople's evolution as an urban centre. The city's centrality in the political, ecclesiastical and economic life of the Byzantine world assured it of an almost constant flow of immigrants. Only in the period immediately following its fall to the Latins in 1204 did Constantinople witness a massive exodus of its inhabitants. Despite their importance, these complex demographic phenomena have hardly been examined and still await a thorough investigation. The same holds true of those bearing on the Jewish community of the city, which during most of the Byzantine period constituted a permanent, though marginal component of the latter's population mosaic. Both immigration and emigration affected its numerical strength, social composition, economic profile and location within the urban space. The investigation of these movements is arduous, since the meagre data at our disposal consist of isolated pieces of evidence. It should be noted, though, that once inserted in their proper Byzantine context, these sources are highly instructive about migration trends and their motivations. This is even the case with documents from the Genizah or synagogue archive of Cairo that at first glance seem to yield only information about specific individuals. In sum, the combination of Greek and Hebrew sources of Byzantine origin, the Genizah documents and western testimonies enables to some extent a reconstruction of Jewish mobility between Constantinople and its demographic hinterland and of its impact on the city's Jewish community.

The presence of Jews in Constantinople is first attested in the quarter of Chalkoprateia, or Copper Market, west of the church of St Sophia. According to the *Patria Konstantinoupoleos*, Jews lived in this quarter since the reign of Constantine I, yet from another, more reliable source, we learn that they were established there by the time of Theodosius II. Upon his return from Asia Minor in 443, the emperor discovered that during his absence from

Constantinople these Jews had built a synagogue with the authorization of the city's prefect, despite the decrees of 415, 423 and 438 prohibiting the construction of new Jewish places of worship.¹ Their initiative implies that they were already established for some time in this urban area and had the means to erect a synagogue. There is no indication, however, about their precise origin nor that of their forebears, nor do we know whether all the Jews of Constantinople were concentrated in Chalkoprateia at that time.

The earliest direct testimonies about Jewish migration to the city appear in the *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*. The hero of this hagiographic work, Jacob, was a young man when in 602 or 603 he left Ptolemais-Akko in Palestine on his first journey to Constantinople, where for a few years he led an adventurous life. He returned to the city in his early forties and after some time entered the service of a rich Greek merchant, who was involved in the illegal export of precious silk textiles from Constantinople. Presumably in 632 Jacob undertook a year-long commercial journey to the province Africa on behalf of this merchant. His employer gave him a letter in order to prevent that he should be 'arrested and mistreated as a Jew', which appears to hint at the persecutions against the Jews and their forcible baptism ordered by Emperor Heraclius.² It would be unwise to draw any general conclusions from this particular case, yet two aspects of Jacob's migrations to Constantinople warrant our attention. First, the tumultuous life and riches of the city and the economic prospects it seemed to offer clearly exerted their attraction on the inhabitants of the provinces, including Jews. Second, Jacob's story reveals the wide geographical range of Jewish migration to Constantinople in the early seventh century. There is good reason to believe that he was not the only Jew emigrating in this period from Palestine or another distant province to the empire's capital.

Political circumstances also generated Jewish migration. Throughout the centuries the Jews enjoyed the status of a protected minority in the empire, except for short periods of religious persecutions. We have no precise indications about the demographic impact of the measures decreed

¹ Th. Preger, *Scriptores originum Constantinopolitanarum* (Leipzig, 1901–7) II, 226–7, §32; Janin, *Les Églises*, 237; A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinopouleos*, *Poikila Byzantina* 8 (Bonn, 1988), 411–4. Legislation about synagogues in A. Linder, *The Jews in Roman Imperial Legislation* (Detroit–Jerusalem, 1987), 267–72, 287–9, 295–301, 323–7, nos. 41, 47, 49, 54, respectively.

² *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*, ed. and trans. V. Déroche in *TM* 11 (1991), 72, 127–9, 215–9 (I.3 and 40–41; V.20); also commentary by G. Dagron, 'Juifs et Chrétiens dans l'Orient du VII^e siècle', 234–46, and for the dating of the work, 246–7. Jacob's return voyage was delayed until an envoy sent from Constantinople enabled his sailing, previously prevented by the authorities, on 13 July 634, which brings us back to the previous year for the dating of his intended departure. As Jacob was paid a yearly salary, he must have left Constantinople in 632, while the persecutions were still going on (see below). This explains the tenor of the letter he was given by his employer.

against the Jews by Heraclius in 630–32, Leo III in 721–22, Basil I in 873–74, and his son Leo VI, after 886. In all these instances the authorities clearly exerted strong pressure on the Jews of Constantinople, as explicitly stated by the sources referring to the Jewish policy of Basil I. It may be assumed, therefore, that the Jews of the capital who during his reign had submitted to baptism under duress, yet secretly upheld their Judaism, felt particularly threatened and sought refuge elsewhere. One of their possible destinations was the Khazar kingdom, in which Judaism had begun to spread within the ruling élite since 864. When, around 930, Romanus I Lecapenus sought to impose baptism on Jews, a large number of them who refused to abjure their faith were apparently allowed to leave the empire and emigrated precisely to the Khazar territories.³ Constantinopolitan Jews were most likely to be found among the expatriates. In all these cases emigration and conversion to Christianity clearly reduced the number of Jews in the capital, despite the return of some fugitives once the persecutions had ceased.

In the wake of the Byzantine expansion under Nicephorus II Phocas and John I Tzimiskes in the 960s and 970s, large numbers of Syrians and particularly of Armenians emigrated into Byzantine Asia Minor, a process that continued in the eleventh century. From sources discussed below we may gather that the Jews were affected by the general political climate and the population movement in this region. A more direct incentive to Jewish migration appeared after 1009, when the Fatimid Caliph al-Hakim initiated a new policy against Jews and Christians. Many of them emigrated from Fatimid territory to Antioch, Laodicea and other Byzantine cities.⁴ According to the chronicler Bar Hebraeus, the Christian fugitives returned from Byzantine territory once the persecutions ended about 1020. One may wonder, however, whether this general statement should be taken at face value.⁵ At any rate, Jews are not mentioned in this context, and somewhat later sources reveal a westward drift of Armenians and Jews in Asia Minor, which reached Constantinople since the early eleventh century. The influx of 'many aliens, Armenians and Arabs and Jews' was held responsible for

³ On imperial policy and persecutions, with references to previous works, see D. Jacoby, 'Les Juifs de Byzance: une communauté marginalisée', in Ch. A. Maltezou, ed., *Οι περιθωριακοί στο Βυζάντιο (Marginality in Byzantium)*, Idryma Goulandri-Horn (Athens, 1993), 117–25; see also O. Pritsak, 'The Khazar Kingdom's Conversion to Judaism', *Harvard Ukrainian Studies* 2 (1978), 261–81.

⁴ G. Dagron, 'Minorités ethniques et religieuses dans l'Orient byzantin à la fin du Xe et au XIe siècle: l'immigration syrienne', *TM* 6 (1976), 177–216, repr. in Dagron, *La Romanité chrétienne en Orient. Héritages et mutations* (London, 1984), X.

⁵ E.A.W. Budge (tr.), *The Chronography of Gregory Abû'l-Faraj, 1225–1286, the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician commonly known as Bar Hebraeus, being the First Part of his Political History of the World* (London, 1932), I, 185. Another of his assertions also lacks credibility: see next note.

the severe riots that erupted in the capital in 1044. Consequently, Emperor Constantine IX ordered the expulsion of all those among them who had settled in the city in the preceding thirty years, which brings us back to 1014.⁶ The origin of these immigrants is not stated, yet the association of the three ethno-religious groups blamed for the disorders clearly points to Syria and Asia Minor. The unstable conditions in Syria and the prospects of security in the empire were the primary factors that generated the population movement into Byzantine Asia Minor.⁷ Yet the later stages of migration towards Constantinople appear to have been related to the economic expansion occurring in that period in the empire and particularly in its capital.⁸ There is no information about the specific occupations of the immigrants, yet there is good reason to believe that craftsmen were included among them.⁹ It is highly doubtful that all those targeted by the expulsion decree of 1044 indeed left Constantinople. Moreover, there is even evidence that Jews continued to settle in the city shortly after that date. The story of Israel ben Nathan is a case in point. This merchant first left his native city, Qayrawan, for Fustat, Old Cairo, and later on, about 1045, settled in the empire's capital, where he married a local Jewish woman. After being imprisoned for some time and suffering other mishaps he decided in 1049 to leave for Jerusalem, with no intention to return. His wife refused to follow him to an Arabic-speaking country, and he divorced her before his departure.¹⁰ Israel ben Nathan's emigration from Constantinople, after a sojourn lasting a few years only, must not have been exceptional among

⁶ *The Chronography of Gregory*, I, 203. 'Arabs' stands here for Muslims in general, regardless of their origin. According to this author, 100,000 people left the city, clearly an absurdly inflated figure.

⁷ On conditions in Syria, see M. Gil, *A History of Palestine, 634–1099* (Cambridge, 1992), 373–81.

⁸ On which see A. Harvey, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire 900–1200* (Cambridge, 1989), esp. 120–243; M.F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c. 300–1450* (Cambridge, 1985), 570–582; also, 'Byzantium, 1081–1204: the Economy revisited Twenty Years on', in Hendy, *The Economy, Fiscal Administration and Coinage of Byzantium* (Northampton, 1989), III, 21–3; on the social background in Constantinople: H. Ahrweiler, 'Recherches sur la société byzantine au XIe siècle: nouvelles hiérarchies et nouvelles solidarités', *TM* 6 (1976), 99–124.

⁹ It is rather unlikely that the immigrants should have exclusively been merchants, as claimed by Z. Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium. The Formative Years, 970–1100* (New York-Jerusalem, 1959), 138–9. On craftsmen, see below.

¹⁰ Israel's letters from Jerusalem dated 22 September 1051 and 11 January 1052, in M. Gil, ed. and trans., *Eretz-Israel ba-tekufa ha-muslemith ha-rishona (634–1099) (Palestine during the first Muslim Period [634–1099])* (Tel Aviv, 1983), II, 120–23, 127–32, nos. 465 and 467; references in N. de Lange, 'Byzantium in the Cairo Genizah', *BMGS* 16 (1992), 45–6. Gil, *A History of Palestine*, 264–5, reconstructs Israel's career, yet errs with respect to the Byzantine episode. Israel's references to a deceased son and an infant daughter imply that his arrival in Constantinople and marriage there were fairly recent. The first letter was written twenty months after his departure from Constantinople, which consequently was not connected with the expulsion ordered in 1044, as claimed by Gil, *Eretz-Israel*, 267 n.42.

the Jews reaching the city. Incidentally, the riots of 1044 may have directly prompted the imperial authorities to transfer the Jewish community from its quarter within the city walls to a new site at Pera, across the Golden Horn.¹¹

Internally this community was already split by that time into two congregations. The Rabbanites belonged to the mainstream of Judaism relying on the Rabbinic oral law exposed in the Talmud, while the Karaites rejected it and advocated the literal exegesis of the Hebrew Bible.¹² The Karaites first established their own congregations in the Arabic-speaking Islamic East. The early phase of their settlement in Constantinople was the outcome of the progressive migratory movement across Asia Minor of the late tenth and eleventh century, examined above. The Karaite congregation in Attaleia in 1028 is the first to be directly documented in the empire, yet from evidence bearing on Tobias ben Moses we may infer that the one of Constantinople already existed about the year 1000. Tobias was apparently born in the city at that time.¹³ From Jerusalem, where he resided in 1040–41, he wrote in Arabic to his daughter by a Byzantine Christian woman, both of whom had remained in Constantinople. The use of Arabic implies the presence in the empire's capital of Karaites capable of conveying the content of the letter to Tobias's daughter. These were thus either immigrants from Arabic-speaking countries, or the offspring of such immigrants using Arabic among themselves.¹⁴ Most likely Tobias belonged to such a family.

In addition to Jewish immigration from Islamic lands to the empire, and Constantinople in particular, common to Karaites and Rabbanites, there also was a movement in the opposite direction. One aspect of the latter was the flow of Greek-speaking students from Constantinople to Jewish centres of learning in the Middle East. Rabbanite students are attested between 1000 and 1038 at the Talmudic academy of Pumbeditha, in Mesopotamia, where some of them were questioned about a Greek loan-word appearing in the Talmud.¹⁵ On the other hand, Byzantine Karaites studied at their own academy in Jerusalem between the 1030s and the 1060s.¹⁶ Some of these students failed to return to Constantinople after completing their scholarly training, either because they had found employment abroad or for other

¹¹ D. Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine', *Byz* 37 (1967), 168–83, repr. in Jacoby, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine* (London, 1975), II.

¹² Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, the only general work on the Karaites in the empire, requires serious emendations.

¹³ Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, 46–51.

¹⁴ Tobias's letters (with Hebrew translation of the one written in Arabic) in Gil, *Palestine during the first Muslim Period*, II, 521–30, nos. 293–6; English summaries by de Lange, 'Byzantium in the Cairo Genizah', 39–40.

¹⁵ J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641–1204* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie 30) (Athens, 1939), 61 and 180–81, no. 122 (trans.).

¹⁶ Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, 49–50, 186–9.

reasons. Among the latter we find Tobias ben Moses, already mentioned above. His wife, a former Christian who had converted to Judaism, returned to her original faith apparently after he had departed for Jerusalem and left her and their common daughter in Constantinople. Later she again switched her allegiance, and the hardships she endured then prompted her to join her husband about 1050. Under these circumstances, it is rather puzzling that Tobias should have returned to Constantinople and become one of the leaders of the Byzantine Karaites, as suggested by a later source, unless his wife had died in the meantime.¹⁷ Tobias's story points to a particular factor that warrants our attention, namely conversion to Judaism. It is impossible to determine whether conversion added many members to the Jewish community of Constantinople. In any event, the pressure exerted by the Church, the imperial authorities and particularly family members induced proselytes to leave Constantinople and seek a safe haven beyond the boundaries of the empire.¹⁸ One of these converts was the archbishop of Bari, Andreas, who in 1066 left his see for Constantinople, where he embraced Judaism. Not surprisingly, after some time he felt threatened and fled to Egypt, presumably with the help of the Rabbanite congregation.¹⁹

The Seljuq advance in Asia Minor following the battle of Manzikert in 1071 generated a massive exodus.²⁰ Jews participated in this movement, as illustrated by the letter an Egyptian Jew wrote about 1089. Before 1071

¹⁷ Gil, *A History of Palestine*, 814–8, reconstructs Tobias's career in the Islamic East and suggests that his migration to Jerusalem may have also been related to the pressure exerted upon him in connection with his wife's first conversion to Judaism. His return to the empire is implied by a query addressed by Constantinopolitan Karaites led by Tobias to their brethren in Jerusalem: source quoted by Z. Ankori, 'Some Aspects of Karaite–Rabbanite Relations on the Eve of the First Crusade', *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 24 (1955), 31–2.

¹⁸ Other cases of emigration from the empire related to conversion, without indication of place of origin: Z. Falk, ed., 'From the Cairo Genizah', *Sinai* 85 (1979), 147–8 (Hebrew), summary by de Lange, 'Byzantium in the Cairo Genizah', 40, no.20, and S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza* (Berkeley–Los Angeles, 1967–88), II, 305, about a case in 1121.

¹⁹ Andreas's conversion deeply impressed a Norman of the same region, who reported it: trans. by J. Prawer, 'The Autobiography of Obadyah the Norman, a Convert to Judaism at the Time of the First Crusade', in I. Twersky, ed., *Studies in Medieval Jewish History and Literature* (Cambridge, Mass., 1979), 114–5. For the dating of Andreas's departure from Bari, however, see V. von Falkenhausen, 'Bari bizantina: profilo di un capoluogo di provincia (secoli IX–XI)', in G. Rossetti, ed., *Spazio, società, potere nell'Italia dei Comuni* (Europa mediterranea, Quaderni, 1) (Napoli, 1986), 221–3. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the story, as suggested by von Falkenhausen, in view of other Byzantine conversions to Judaism, a few of which are noted above. The total silence of Byzantine and western sources about Andreas's fate after 1066 may be ascribed to their reluctance to report the archbishop's conversion.

²⁰ S. Vryonis Jr., *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley, 1971), 110–71.

he had been living in eastern Asia Minor, yet after the Seljuq victory he fled westwards with his family and eventually settled in Thessalonica.²¹ Other Jews surely reached Constantinople. Individual Jewish migration from Egypt to this city continued at a later period. Thus, for instance, between 1093 and 1096 an Egyptian Jew sent a letter from this city to his brother * living in Egypt, in which he described a local feud between the Rabbanites and Karaites.²² The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela, who visited Constantinople in the early 1160s, mentions the Jewish physician of Emperor Manuel I, Salomon the Egyptian.²³ To be sure, toponymic surnames were inherited and, therefore, reveal neither the identity of the individual who migrated, nor the timing or itinerary of his migration. The surname of the physician nevertheless provides a useful testimony in this respect for the first half of the twelfth century.

As noted above, economic developments partly explain Jewish migration to Constantinople in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. In 1137 a successful and prosperous Jewish physician established for some time in Seleucia encouraged his relatives in Egypt to join him. We may assume that similar letters were sent from the capital. Not all newcomers to this city had a professional training. Thus, for instance, from the letter of 1137 we learn that a scholar hailing from Baghdad, who had studied in Jerusalem, made pancakes for a living in Constantinople.²⁴ Tanning was a widespread occupation among Jews around the Mediterranean, including the empire, to the extent that it was used in Byzantine anti-Jewish polemics as a simile for Judaism. The origin of the tanners whom Benjamin of Tudela encountered in Pera cannot be determined, as they may have come from any region of the empire. It is noteworthy that around 1150, thus shortly before Benjamin's visit, the bishop of Chonae in Phrygia had compelled the Jews, among them apparently many tanners, to leave his city.²⁵ The skills required for the manufacture of silk fabrics and garments were not so common. From the 'Book of the Prefect' we may infer that Jewish silk weavers operated in Constantinople in the tenth, and possibly even in the ninth century,²⁶ while

²¹ Trans. and commentary of his letter by Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, V, 438–43. There is no evidence that this Jew resided for some time in Constantinople, as suggested in Goitein, I, 58.

²² For the relocation and redating of this letter, see D. Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Comnenian to the Palaeologan Period', *VV* 55 (1994) (forthcoming). *

²³ M. N. Adler, ed. and trans., *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela* (London, 1907), Hebrew text, 16; English trans., 14.

²⁴ S.D. Goitein, trans., 'A Letter from Seleucia (Cilicia), dated 21 July 1137', *Speculum* 39 (1964), 299–303, with commentary.

²⁵ Jacoby, 'Les Juifs de Byzance', 133–4, 142–3, 150–51.

²⁶ See D. Jacoby, 'The Jews and the Silk Industry of Constantinople', in A. Lambropoulou, ed., *Η Εβραϊκή παρουσία στον Ελλαδικό χώρο (The Jewish Presence in the Greek Space, 4th–19th Centuries)* (Athens, 1995) (forthcoming). *

Jewish silk dyers are attested since the eleventh century.²⁷ Genizah sources reveal that the unstable conditions in eleventh- and twelfth-century Syria and Palestine induced Jewish silk weavers and dyers to leave for Egypt, while circumstantial evidence suggests that some artisans plying the same trades emigrated from these three countries to Thebes. We may postulate a similar movement towards Constantinople, also an important silk centre. On the other hand, Thebes apparently attracted silk workers from other Byzantine silk centres, including Constantinople, in order to replace those of its artisans who had been deported by the Normans to Sicily in 1147.²⁸ A further wave of professional emigration followed the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204, when Greek and Jewish silk workers seem to have left the city to join the silk industry in the Greek state of Nicaea. Their successors continued to ply their trade in western Asia Minor after the Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in 1261.²⁹

Several years ago I assumed, on the basis of western evidence, that Jews had been absent from Constantinople during the Latin period.³⁰ In fact, an overlooked source points to their presence within the city walls in 1205 or 1206.³¹ It is impossible, however, to locate them up to the reign of Michael VIII, when they were settled in the region of Vlanga extending along the southern shore of Constantinople. This Jewry included tanners, like the one of Pera visited by Benjamin of Tudela about a century earlier,³² yet this occupational continuity does not imply that the exercise of the craft was restricted to local Jews. Michael VIII encouraged the repopulation of Constantinople after recovering the city in 1261.³³ Too little attention has been hitherto devoted to the economic aspect of this policy, the purpose of which was to further both trade and industrial activity in the capital. The encomium of Nicaea delivered by Theodore Metochites, presumably in 1290, mentions the transfer of various crafts from the territories of the former empire of Nicaea to Constantinople after 1261.³⁴ The encomium does not specifically refer to Jews, yet it is not excluded that Michael VIII also promoted

* ²⁷ D. Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade', *BZ* 84/85 (1991–92), 482 n.169, and 486.

²⁸ Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', 485–6.

²⁹ See above, n.26.

³⁰ Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 188–9.

³¹ Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople' (as above, n.22).

³² Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 189–96.

³³ On repopulation, see D.G. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258–1282. A Study in Byzantine–Latin Relations* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 122–3, 131–7; Kl.-P. Matschke, 'Grund- und Hauseigentum in und um Konstantinopel in späbyzantinischer Zeit', *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte* 1984/IV, 106–9.

* ³⁴ K.N. Sathas, *Mesaiōnikē bibliothēkē* (Venice–Athens–Paris, 1872–94), I, 152. For the dating, see I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métochite et Nicéphore Choumnos* (Brussels, 1962), 137–40.

the migration of Jewish craftsmen from the provinces. In any event, later sources that will soon be adduced confirm such a movement.

The extensive privileges granted to Venice and Genoa, the virtual extra-territorial status enjoyed by their respective quarters, and the growing economic activity of their nationals in Constantinople since the reign of Michael VIII introduced a new factor, which enhanced Jewish immigration to the city throughout the Palaeologan period. Economic and fiscal considerations induced both maritime powers to grant their protection to Byzantine subjects, including Jews, engaged in various occupations. The grant of Venetian or Genoese nationality extended the exemption from Byzantine taxation and jurisdiction to these imperial subjects, to the benefit of their employers.³⁵ Sometime before 1319 Venetian Jewish workers were exercising jointly with Byzantine Jews the tanning of hides and the dressing of furs imported from the Black Sea. Emperor Andronicus II complained that numerous Venetian Jewish craftsmen were in fact imperial subjects from the provinces who, after settling in the city, had obtained Venetian status there.³⁶

The commercial and maritime links between the respective outposts of Venice and Genoa in the Mediterranean and the Black Sea also furthered migration to and from Constantinople. Between 1300 and 1330 a Venetian Jew fled from Negroponte to Constantinople and presumably joined the local community of Venetian Jews settled in the *Judaica* of Venice's quarter.³⁷ Somewhat later, in 1343, a Catalan Jew appears among Romaniote Jews from Venetian Crete established in this *Judaica*.³⁸ The *contratta Judeorum* located within Genoa's quarter at Pera also attracted immigrants. In 1389 Romaniote

³⁵ On this policy, see D. Jacoby, 'Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Roumanie du XIII^e au milieu du XV^e siècle', *TM* 8 (1981), 217–35, repr. in Jacoby, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion* (Northampton, 1989), IX; also, 'Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin: citoyens, sujets et protégés (1261–1453)', *La Storia dei Genovesi* 9 (1989), 245–84.

³⁶ Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 196–205; also, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews in the Eastern Mediterranean', in G. Cozzi, ed., *Gli Ebrei e Venezia (secoli XIV–XVIII)* (Milan, 1987), 38–9, repr. in Jacoby, *Studies*, X.

³⁷ According to a Hebrew letter ed. by C. Bernheimer, 'Document relatif aux Juifs de Négropont', *Revue des études juives* 65 (1913), 224–8; tr. by S.B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204–1453* (University of Alabama, 1985), 234–8, esp. 235 (no. 30); for the dating, see 238, 240, and Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews', 55, n.52. On the community and *Judaica* of the Venetian Jews, see Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 205–12; and 'Les Juifs vénitiens de Constantinople et leur communauté du XIII^e au XV^e siècle', *Revue des études juives* 131 (1972), 397–410, repr. in Jacoby, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XII^e au XV^e siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies* (London, 1979), XII.

³⁸ Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 206, 208, 213–4, and 221–3, doc. I. A Venetian Jew bearing a Greek surname, attested in 1350, appears to have come from Crete: M. Balard, A.E. Laiou and C. Otten-Froux, eds., *Les Italiens à Byzance*, *Byzantina Sorbonensia* 6 (Paris, 1987), 125–6, no.27.

Jews, among them from Genoese Chios, and a western Jew resided there, and by 1391 they had been joined by a Catalan Jew.³⁹ Larger numbers of Catalan Jews apparently arrived in Constantinople after the anti-Jewish riots of that year in Barcelona. The account book of the Venetian merchant Giacomo Badoer, who resided in Constantinople from 1436 to 1440, refers to some of them.⁴⁰ In 1331–32 the Arab traveller Ibn Battuta encountered at the imperial court a Syrian Jew who served as interpreter.⁴¹ Jews bearing Arabic names appear in 1390 in the Genoese quarter and later in the account book of Giacomo Badoer.⁴² In short, the presence of Venice and Genoa in Constantinople generated some important developments. Instead of a concentration of all the Jews of the city within a single urban area, as attested in the eleventh and twelfth centuries, we witness in the Palaeologan period the existence of three distinct Jewish communities, one in the imperial section of the city and another in each of the respective quarters of the two maritime powers. Each of these communities was subjected to a different jurisdiction. Furthermore, it would seem that a shift in immigration currents occurred in this period. Up to the Fourth Crusade most Jews settling in Constantinople seem to have come from the eastern provinces of the empire and from Islamic countries. By contrast, the privileged status of Venice and Genoa in the empire's capital reinforced the movement of Jews from western Romania and the West proper, in larger numbers than ever before.⁴³ Greek-speaking Romaniote Jews nevertheless remained the dominant group within the Jewish community of Constantinople up to the massive arrival of Spanish Jews in the late fifteenth century.

We may now attempt to draw some general conclusions from the scattered and incomplete evidence presented above. Jewish migration related to Constantinople was prompted by political, military, economic, social or cultural incentives. Yet these did not necessarily coincide with the factors and developments inducing or conditioning members of other ethnic, religious or social groups to migrate to, or from the empire's capital. Indeed,

³⁹ Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 215–6; M. Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XIIe – début du XVe siècle)* (Rome, 1978), I, 277–9, 350, yet contrary to this author there was no continuity between the pre-1204 Jewish quarter and the *contratta Judeorum* in Pera: see Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople' (as above, n.22).

⁴⁰ Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople', 213–4; U. Dorini and T. Bertelè, eds., *Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer (Costantinopoli 1436–1440)* (Rome, 1956), 54–5, 214, 636–7: Leonin and Signorin, once coupled with a Greek surname, which points to intermarriage between Romaniote and Spanish Jews.

⁴¹ C. Defrémery and B.R. Sanguinetti, eds. and trans., *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah* (Paris, 1914–26), II, 428–9.

⁴² Balard, *La Romanie génoise* I, 278: Saluchan; Dorini and Bertelè, *Il libro dei conti di Giacomo Badoer*, 164: Salaiman Zudio.

⁴³ I believe that this picture is not just the outcome of a shift in documentation resulting from the absence of relevant sources from the Genizah since the thirteenth century.

Jewish mobility also responded to particular motivations and, therefore, its nature, dynamics, pattern and network differed to some extent, and at times even substantially, from those of non-Jewish mobility.⁴⁴ This was definitely the case with migration caused by religious persecutions, whether of a local or a general nature, or by the pressure on converts to Judaism. The same holds true with respect to intellectual pursuits, which acted as a powerful stimulus to individual mobility along particular itineraries, differing from those conditioning migration related to economic factors.⁴⁵ Such was the case with migration towards Jerusalem. It is noteworthy that Constantinople was not necessarily the final, nor the most desired destination in the empire of every enterprising Jewish merchant or craftsman. This is well illustrated, for instance, by the migration of the Egyptian Jew who after 1071 settled in Thessalonica, rather than in the capital, and by the currents of professional emigration from Constantinople, despite the city's major role as an economic centre.

With the exception of Palestine before the Arab conquest, a notable feature of medieval Jewish society was its overwhelmingly urban character. Consequently, Jewish migration was essentially an inter-urban phenomenon. It is well known that city dwellers are more prone to move than peasants. Yet this would not be sufficient by itself to explain why Jews constituted such a highly mobile element in the empire's population, nor the wide geographical range of their migrations. An important factor furthering these features, both to the benefit and the loss of the Jewry of Constantinople, was the tightly-knit internal organization of the individual Rabbanite and Karaite congregations, essential for the collective survival of their members' religious and ethnic identity. The congregation attended not only to the religious and judicial requirements of its members, but also fulfilled important social functions. It was highly supportive of needy individuals, scholars, captives to be ransomed, refugees, immigrants, pilgrims and proselytes, who could expect to be taken care of upon their arrival. This explains the presence of Byzantine Jews, among them possibly a number from Constantinople, recorded in Egypt among the beneficiaries of communal help.⁴⁶ Moreover, strong links existed between the various

⁴⁴ For examples and references, see above.

⁴⁵ See also Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society* I, 51–4. To be sure, similar phenomena existed within Christian minority groups in the empire, and one should also take into account the solidarity existing within the monastic community. Yet their networks were different and among Jews study appears to have been a more potent factor of migration than in Christian society.

⁴⁶ The communal organization is best documented for Egypt by the sources of the Genizah: Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, 327, 329–30; II, 55, 79, 91–143, 153–4, 169–70, 306–8; V, 36. Ransoming of Egyptian Jews brought as slaves to Constantinople, in an undated letter: S. Assaf, *Mekorot u-mechkarim be-toldoth Yisrael (Sources and Studies in the History of Israel)* (Jerusalem, 1945) (Hebrew), 145 n.12. In an undated, twelfth-century letter an Egyptian Jewess praised the Byzantine Jews for ransoming their relatives: trans. by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, 214, no.162.

Rabbanite and Karaite congregations, respectively, which were fostered by a constant movement of visitors, messengers, official and private correspondence, religious requirements, such as the supply of ritually prepared food and wine, queries addressed to renowned masters, and the flow of those eager to study under their guidance. The brotherhood of Jewish scholarship thrived on the use of Hebrew. Women lacked similar bonds and, therefore, were far less inclined to abandon their social and cultural milieu and to integrate within a foreign environment, the language of which they did not speak.⁴⁷

There can be no doubt that the existence of the intercongregational network had a strong impact on the channelling of Jewish migration. Except for short periods of persecutions, the Jews enjoyed both within and outside the empire the status of a tolerated minority. On the whole there were no political, religious or cultural impediments to their mobility, and they moved across political and cultural boundaries more easily than members of any other ethnic or religious groups. The geographical expanse over which the Jewish communities were dispersed was unique in its dimensions. It explains the considerable range of Jewish migration and the vast extent of Constantinople's demographic hinterland.

⁴⁷ See above, 224; also Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, III, 177; V, 439.

THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF CONSTANTINOPLE FROM THE KOMNENAN TO THE PALAIOLOGAN PERIOD*

The Jewish traveller Benjamin of Tudela has left us a brief, yet invaluable account of the thriving Jewish community he encountered in Constantinople in the early 1160s¹. Some forty years later, in 1203-1204, the Latin armies participating in the Fourth Crusade besieged and eventually captured the Byzantine capital, which suffered severe hardship. Large sections of the city were burned down, including the Jewish quarter, and the Latin conquest was followed by a massive exodus of the Greek population². The fate of the Jews of Constantinople in the following decades has hitherto remained unknown. However, an overlooked testimony in an anti-Jewish work sheds some light on their presence in the city during the period of Latin rule, which lasted from 1204 to 1261. It is imperative to consider it within the context of Constantinople's evolution from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan period.

Jews resided in the Empire's capital since the fifth century and, despite fragmentary evidence, appear to have continuously lived there up to the Fourth Crusade. At an unknown date before the eleventh century, the imperial authorities began to enforce upon them a policy of residential segregation motivated by religious considerations. About 1044 they tightened this policy by removing the Jews from their quarter, located within the city walls, to the suburb of Galata or Pera across the Golden Horn, where they still resided at the time of Benjamin of Tudela's visit³. Pera had then a semi-rural character, which it still retained by the early fourteenth century⁴. Yet the Jewish quarter appears to have been densely covered with wooden houses, as implied by the swift spreading of the fire that destroyed it in 1203⁵. The quarter extended on the slope of Pera facing Constantinople, in the vicinity of the tower on the shore to which the chain closing the Golden Horn was attached⁶. This location is indirectly confirmed by the activity of the Jewish tanners mentioned by Benjamin. Since they needed water for the exercise of their craft, they must have resided in the lower section of the suburb. Benjamin ascribed the animosity of the Greeks of Pera toward the Jews to these tanners, who by spilling into the streets the malodorous

* I wish to thank the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung for a *Forschungspreis* enabling me to carry out research for this study, and my friend and colleague Peter Schreiner for inviting me to the Byzantine Department, University of Cologne.

¹ M. N. Adler (ed.), *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, (London, 1907) [hereafter: BT], Hebrew text pp. 14-17; trans., pp. 1-14. The dating of Benjamin's travels within the Empire to the early 1160s will be discussed elsewhere.

² For details, see below.

³ See D. Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine," *Byzantion*, 37 (1967), pp. 168-189, repr. in idem, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine*, (London, 1975), no. 2.

⁴ See G. I. Brătianu, *Recherches sur le commerce génois dans la mer Noire au XIII^e siècle*, (Paris, 1929), pp. 92-93; M. Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XII^e - début du XV^e siècle)*, (Rome, 1978), vol. 1, pp. 184-185; Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," p. 186; idem, "Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin: citoyens, sujets et protégés (1261-1453)," *La Storia dei Genovesi*, 9 (1989), pp. 268 and 284, n. 120.

⁵ On this fire, see Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," pp. 176, 178, 188 and n. 4. An earlier fire, in 1077, had also inflicted heavy damage upon the Jewish quarter: *ibid.*, p. 178.

⁶ See Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," pp. 175-178, 185-187, and the plan of Pera in Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, p. 189, on which the tower is marked as "château de Galata."

liquids deriving from the processing of the hides incommmodated their neighbors⁷. Benjamin also referred to other occupational groups within the Jewish community, namely Jewish silk workers and merchants, some of whom were wealthy. He singled out the Jewish physician of Manuel I Komnenos, Solomon the Egyptian, because of his privileged status and his intercessions with the emperor on behalf of the Jews of the Empire.

Several documents preserved in the Cairo Geniza or synagogue archive provide additional information about the Jewish community of Constantinople in the Komnenan period. A noteworthy feature of this community since the early eleventh century was the coexistence in its midst of two congregations. The Rabbanites belonged to the mainstream of Judaism, which relied on rabbinical tradition based on the Talmud, while the Karaites rejected this tradition and advocated the literal exegesis of the Hebrew Bible. The Karaite movement developed at first in the Muslim East, where its main congregations were located. Karaite immigrants apparently began to settle in Constantinople about the year 1000⁸. The existence of two distinct congregations in the city, each with its own institutions, is confirmed by a letter sent to both of them in the second decade of the twelfth century⁹. At the time of Benjamin's visit, the Karaite group numbered some 500 individuals, compared to some 2,000 Rabbanites, and thus represented about one fifth of the total Jewish population of the city. The two congregations resided then side by side in Pera, a wall separating the residences of their respective members. The events leading to the building of this partition are apparently recorded in an undated eleventh-century Jewish letter, which provides a wealth of information on the Jewish community of Constantinople in the early Komnenan period¹⁰. The issues this letter raises warrant a close examination, since they offer an insight into the internal development of the community, the latter's connections with other Jewish communities, its insertion within the networks of long-distance trade and shipping and, finally, the imperial policy to which it was subjected.

The author of the epistle, a recent immigrant from Egypt, belonged to the Rabbanite congregation. He sent his eyewitness account of the events from an unspecified location in the Empire to his brother, who had remained in Fustat or Old Cairo. In the past, a severe ongoing dispute between Rabbanites and Karaites about the Jewish festival calendar had repeatedly generated severe tension between the two congregations. In the year preceding the writing of the letter, the Karaites had again relied on information received from Erets-Israel, the Land of Israel, to determine the date of the Passover festival. On the other hand, the Rabbanites maintained their own stand on the strength of letters received from Egypt, and Jewish merchants from Russia

* ⁷ There is good reason to believe, however, that the Greek animosity was more deeply ingrained and of a more general nature: see D. Jacoby, "Les Juifs de Byzance: une communauté marginalisée," in *Οἱ περιθωριακοὶ τὸ Βυζάντιο*, ed. Ch. A. Maltezou, (Athens, 1993), pp. 142-143, on the use of tanning as a simile for Judaism in anti-Jewish ecclesiastical polemics in the Empire.

* ⁸ Z. Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium. The Formative Years, 970-1100*, (New York, Jerusalem, 1959), remains the only comprehensive study on the Karaites in the Empire, yet requires substantial emendations on several important issues. On Karaite immigration to Constantinople, see D. Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland," in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland. Papers from the Twenty-seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993*, (Aldershot, Hampshire, 1995), p. 225.

⁹ Ed. A. Neubauer, "Egyptian Fragments," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 9 (1896-1897), p. 32; partial trans. by J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641-1204* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie, 30), (Athens, 1939), pp. 214-215, no. 163. The letter was sent "to the holy congregations" of Constantinople; note the plural. For the dating after 1112, see S. D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967-1993), vol. 2, p. 281.

¹⁰ Ed. J. Mann, *Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature*, (Cincinnati, Philadelphia, 1931-1935), vol. 1, pp. 48-51, and see vol. 2, p. 1458; trans. and discussion in Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 182-184, no. 125; further discussion and new dating by Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, pp. 148-150, 322-334, and A. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade*, (London, 1971), pp. 120-121. Yet see below, for a revised dating.

who happened to be at the site of the dispute concurred with them. The strain between the two congregations intensified to the extent that the Rabbanites assaulted the Karaites, who filed a charge against their opponents with the Byzantine authorities¹¹. These held the Rabbanite congregation responsible for the disturbances and imposed upon it a huge fine of about 1,000 "dinars hyperpyra"¹².

The feud within the Jewish community described in the letter has been located by some historians in Thessalonike and by others in Constantinople. For several reasons, this last attribution appears definitely more plausible. First, the sheer size of the fine, discussed below, points to a large Jewish Rabbanite congregation, which would fit the one existing in Constantinople. According to Benjamin of Tudela, in the early 1160s the Rabbanite group in Constantinople consisted of some 2,000 individuals, whereas in Thessalonike the total number of Jews did not exceed the 500 mark. We may safely assume that the Rabbanite congregation in the capital had always been the largest in the Empire. Secondly, the intensity of the feud described in the letter implies the existence of a sizeable Karaite congregation challenging its Rabbanite opponent. Since the beginning of their settlement in the Empire the Karaites were undoubtedly more numerous in Constantinople than in any other Byzantine city. Their congregation in Thessalonike is not mentioned by Benjamin, nor by other sources before the early thirteenth century¹³. In any event, it must have been rather small. The numerical strength of the Karaites in Constantinople, long before the 1160s, would have clearly warranted the construction of the partition in the midst of the Jewish quarter of Pera some time after the calendar feud described in the epistle¹⁴.

The suggested dating of this dispute to the 1060s or 1070s must be revised¹⁵. We have already noted that the author of the letter mentions a fine of 1,000 "dinars hyperpyra." The hyperpyron was introduced by Alexios I Komnenos in 1092, in the framework of his monetary reform. To be sure, the name of this gold coin had occasionally been applied to the nomisma earlier in the eleventh century, yet the reference to it in connection with the fine implies that the imperial authorities had stated the amount to be paid in this denomination and that the hyperperon was already in circulation¹⁶. We may thus safely assume that the letter was written after 1092. The reference to the letters from the Land of Israel upon which the Karaites of Constantinople relied offers an additional clue for the dating of the calendar feud in this city. About 1078 the Karaite academy of learning in Jerusalem was transferred to Tyre, which harboured an important Karaite congregation. At that time there was also a significant Karaite group in Ascalon. Yet since neither of these cities was considered by Jews to be within the boundaries of the biblical Land of Israel, the Karaite letters dealing with the calendar must after all have been dispatched from Jerusalem. To be sure, the religious authority of the Karaites' center in this city had been weakened by the removal of the academy to Tyre, yet Karaite scholarly activity is attested in the Holy City as late as 1095¹⁷. The crusader conquest of Jerusalem in 1099 put an abrupt end to the existence of the city's Jewish congregations¹⁸. In view of the severe disruption of communal

¹¹ The language of the letter points to a physical assault, and the building of a partition between the two groups, aimed at preventing such clashes, supports this interpretation; on the partition, see also below.

¹² I have checked the reading of the word following "dinar," which clearly is *hyperpir*, or "hyperpyron," and not *ipernir* as in Mann, *Text and Studies*, vol. 1, p. 50, line 37.

¹³ See below, pp. 8-9.

¹⁴ Further arguments in favor of Constantinople are adduced below.

¹⁵ I correct here the dating adopted in Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," p. 178.

¹⁶ See M. I. Hendy, *Coinage and Money in the Byzantine Empire, 1081-1261*, (Washington, 1969), pp. 14, 34-37; idem, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c. 300-1450*, (Cambridge, 1985), pp. 513-517.

¹⁷ On the Karaite congregations of Tyre and Ascalon since the capture of Jerusalem by the Seljuqs in 1071, see M. Gil, *A History of Palestine, 634-1099*, (Cambridge, 1992), pp. 416-418, 744-774, and on Jerusalem in 1095, *ibid.*, pp. 417, 802, 820.

¹⁸ See J. Prawer, *The History of the Jews in the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem*, (Oxford, 1988), pp. 19-34.

life caused by this event, it is difficult to imagine that in the following years Karaite refugees from Jerusalem should have been in a position to advise their brethren in Constantinople on religious matters¹⁹. We may thus consider 1099 a *terminus ad quem* for the calendar feud described in the letter.

An even more precise dating appears possible. Significantly, the writer of the letter fails to refer to the western contingents of the First Crusade arriving in Constantinople since the 1st of August 1096, nor does he record the messianic movement that this expedition generated in several Jewish communities of the Empire, including that of Thessalonike. Moreover, he fails to mention another instance, datable to September 1096, in which Rabbanites and Karaites in Constantinople differed as to the date of the Jewish New Year²⁰. It follows that the events he reports must have occurred between 1092 and August 1096, at the latest. This dating is further supported by the peculiar way in which he records the fine imposed by the imperial authorities upon the Rabbanite Jews. After mentioning gold dinars, with which his brother living in Egypt was acquainted, he refers to hyperpyra, the Byzantine gold coins in which the penalty was actually stated. The brother was apparently not yet familiar with these coins, the circulation of which had begun only a short time earlier. This would explain why the author of the letter deemed it necessary to quote jointly the two denominations.

The epistle of the Egyptian Jew contains yet another piece of information enhancing the location of the calendar feud in Constantinople and the dating of the events surrounding it to the years 1092-1096. The writer entrusted his letter to a Christian merchant from Amalfi who was about to sail from the Empire to Alexandria and with whom another Jew was acquainted²¹. Amalfitans had traded in both Constantinople and Egypt since the tenth century. They are attested in the Byzantine capital in 944. An Amalfitan colony was established along the Golden Horn before 1053, and Amalfitan *ergasteria* are mentioned in the same urban area in the charter which Alexios I Komnenos issued in favor of Venice in 1082. Naval assistance provided in 969 to the Fatimid conquest of Egypt ensured the Amalfitans of friendly relations and favorable trading conditions in this country in the following period²². By the mid-eleventh century they had extended the geographic range of their maritime trade in the eastern Mediterranean and were regularly sailing between Constantinople and Alexandria. About 1060 some Amalfitans brought three Jews captured by Byzantine pirates to the Jewish community of Alexandria and freed them in return for the sum they had paid as ransom²³. Egyptian Jews appear to have entertained friendly relations with Amalfitan merchants and occasionally travelled on board Amalfitan ships. Our epistle implies that this was also the case in the 1090s²⁴. Incidentally, the regular sailing of Amalfitan craft between Constantinople and Alexandria in the second half of the eleventh century goes far to explain the

¹⁹ On these refugees, see S. D. Goitein, "Geniza Sources for the Crusader Period: a Survey," in B. Z. Kedar, H. E. Mayer, R. C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer. Studies in the History of the Crusading Kingdom of Jerusalem, Presented to Joshua Prawer*, (Jerusalem, 1982), pp. 311-314.

²⁰ These events are reported in a letter and a Karaite treatise, respectively: ed. Neubauer, "Egyptian Fragments," pp. 27-29, and Aaron ben Elijah, *Gan 'Eden*, ed. J. Savsakan, (Eupatoria, 1866), I. 8, p. 8d; trans. and discussion by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 203-206, 208-209, nos. 153-154. The case reported in the treatise occurred at the time the "Ashkenazim" or Latins participating in the First Crusade came to Constantinople, thus since early August 1096. On the meaning of "Ashkenazim," see also Goitein, "Geniza Sources," p. 312.

²¹ *Mulfitanin*: this word is identified here for the first time.

²² See M. Balard, "Amalfi et Byzance (Xe-XIIIe siècles)," *Travaux et mémoires*, 6 (1976), pp. 87-92, yet the presence of Amalfitans in Constantinople in 944 does not point to the existence of a colony; S. Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici* (Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, Miscellanea di studi e memorie, 26), (Venice, 1988), pp. 7-8; B. Figliuolo, "Amalfi e il Levante nel medioevo," in G. Airdi e B. Z. Kedar (eds.), *I Comuni italiani nel Regno crociato di Gerusalemme* (Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da Geo Pistarino, 48), (Genoa, 1986), pp. 582-588.

²³ See Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. 1, p. 329.

²⁴ For an earlier period, see S. D. Goitein (trans.), *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*, (Princeton, NJ, 1973), pp. 42-45, no. 5: in the mid-eleventh century a Jew travels on an Amalfitan ship from Alexandria to Amalfi.

establishment of Amalfitan hospices in Antioch and Jerusalem, presumably in the 1070s, as well as Amalfitan pilgrimages to the Holy City before the First Crusade²⁵. In our specific context, though, it is important to stress that there is no evidence for Amalfitan activity in Thessalonike, which provides yet another argument against the location of the calendar feud in this city.

As mentioned above, our epistle includes an allusion to Jewish merchants from Russia. A Jewish Rabbanite congregation is documented in Kiev as early as the first half of the tenth century²⁶. About the year 1000, a Jew from Russia, who spoke his native Russian tongue, yet knew neither Hebrew, Greek nor Arabic, arrived in Thessalonike, where he met his relative who had just returned from Jerusalem²⁷. On the basis of this piece of evidence it has been suggested that Russian Jews came to Thessalonike to attend the annual fair of St. Demetrios and that, consequently, the calendar feud should be located in this city rather than in Constantinople. One should note, however, that *Timarion*, a work composed about 1110 and thus reflecting later conditions, clearly stresses that while most commodities arrived directly at the fair of St. Demetrios, those of the Black Sea were first shipped to Constantinople and carried from there by land²⁸. It would seem, then, that Russian merchants did not proceed beyond the Empire's capital to attend the fair of St. Demetrios. In addition, it appears excluded that they should have travelled by land from a Black Sea port to Thessalonike and bypassed Constantinople, because of the long distance involved in such a journey²⁹. In any event, the temporary presence of the two Russian Jews in Thessalonike about the year 1000 does not imply that Russian merchants or Jews regularly visited the city at that time³⁰. We are on safer ground with respect to Russian trade with Constantinople, stimulated by the tenth-century treaties concluded between the princes of Kiev and the Empire³¹. Russian merchants continued to appear in Constantinople in the following century³². This was apparently also the case with Jewish merchants from Russia. A Rabbinic

²⁵ On Amalfitan trade in the Levant and pilgrimage to Jerusalem, see Figliuolo, "Amalfi e il Levante," pp. 589-593, 609-610, and on the hospices, R. Hiestand, "Die Anfänge der Johanniter," in J. Fleckenstein und M. Hellmann (eds.), *Die geistlichen Ritterorden Europas* (Vorträge und Forschungen, 26), (Sigmaringen, 1980), pp. 33-37.

²⁶ See N. Golb and O. Pritsak, *Khazarian-Hebrew Documents of the Tenth Century*, (Ithaca, London, 1982), pp. 5-15, 20-32.

²⁷ Ed. J. Mann, *The Jews in Egypt and Palestine under the Fatimid Caliphs*, (London, 1920-1922), vol. 2, p. 192, and see vol. 1, pp. 165-166; trans. and discussion by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 171-172, no. 119.

²⁸ R. Romano (ed.), *Pseudo-Luciano, Timarione. Testo critico, introduzione, traduzione, commentario e lessico*, (Naples, 1974), pp. 54-55, lines 147-157. Romano's translation on pp. 96-97 is erroneous and misses the main point concerning the Black Sea merchants. Sound arguments for the re-dating of the text by E. Th. Tsolakes, Τιμάριον. Μία νέα Ανάγνωση, in *Μνήμη Σταμάτη Καρατζά* (Thessalonike, 1990), pp. 109-117.

²⁹ This route has recently been suggested by N. Oikonomides, "Le marchand byzantin des provinces (IXe-XIe s.)," in *Mercati e mercanti nell' alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* (Settimane di studio del centro italiano sull'alto medioevo, 40), (Spoleto, 1993), p. 649. The author points to the absence of Constantinopolitan intermediaries in this context, yet it should be stressed that *Timarion* is concerned with the origin of the commodities arriving at the fair, and not with the merchants bringing them. Thus, for instance, there is a fair chance that the goods originating in Egypt and "Phoenicia," i. e. the crusader Levant, were shipped to Thessalonike by Venetian merchants, who about that time conducted trade between the Empire and the Eastern Mediterranean lands: see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo*, p. 17.

³⁰ While Bulgarian merchants did so: see N. Oikonomides, "Le kommerktion d'Abydos, Thessalonique et le commerce bulgare au IXe siècle," in V. Kravari, J. Lefort et C. Morrisson (eds.), *Hommes et richesses dans l'Empire byzantin*, (Paris, 1989-1991), vol. 2, pp. 244-248, esp. 247.

³¹ See their recent analysis by M. Hellmann, "Die Handelsverträge zwischen Kiev und Byzanz," in *Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa, Teil IV, Der Handel der Karolinger- und Wikingerzeit*, ed. Kl. Düwel et al. (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philol.-histor. Kl., Dritte Folge, 156), (Göttingen, 1987), pp. 644-666. See also J. Ferluga, "Der byzantinische Handel nach dem Norden im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert," in the same volume, pp. 629-642; G. G. Litavrin, "Die Kiever Rus' und Byzanz im 9. und 10. Jahrhundert," *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 18 (1992), pp. 43-59.

³² For 1043, see G. Cedreni, *Historiarum compendium*, ed. B. G. Niebuhr, (Bonn 1839), vol. 2, p. 551, lines 1-7; Litavrin, "Die Kiever Rus' und Byzanz," pp. 46-47. See also N. Oikonomides, Ρώσοι έμποροι και στρατιώτες στην Κωνσταντινούπολη, in *Χίλια χρόνια Ελληνισμού - Ρωσσίας. Hellas-Russia. One Thousand Years of Bonds*, (Athens, 1994), pp. 41-51.

responsum dated to 1031-1040 refers to a Jew who arrived in Constantinople, presumably from Russia, after having been ransomed by a Byzantine or a Russian Jew³³. Our epistle adds yet another testimony, this time for the 1090s³⁴. One may wonder whether the Jewish merchants from Kievan Russia visiting Constantinople were subject to the same residential restrictions as the other Russian merchants³⁵, or whether they were allowed to stay in the Jewish quarter of Pera for an unlimited period, like the local Jews.

Our epistle of the 1090s reveals some aspects of the imperial policy applied to the Jews of the Empire. The authorities clearly considered each community a single body, regardless of its internal division between Rabbanites and Karaites. This is illustrated by the removal of the entire Jewish population from Constantinople proper to Pera about 1044 and by the residential segregation imposed on both congregations in the same urban area, where they lived side by side³⁶. In addition, in Constantinople the Eparch of the city either appointed a single Jewish official or confirmed him in his function as head of the entire community, a procedure applied in Thessalonike. A Greek satirical work composed in Constantinople shortly after 1158, thus approximately at the time of Benjamin of Tudela's visit, refers to the ἐξάρχων and τῆς συναγωγῆς ὁ πρῶτιστος³⁷. From Benjamin we may gather that he belonged to the Rabbanite congregation, because it was larger than its Karaite counterpart³⁸. This official was surely entrusted with the levy of the collective taxes imposed upon the entire Jewish community and their orderly delivery to the imperial treasury. The division of the fiscal burden between Rabbanites and Karaites was an internal Jewish matter, which obviously required some degree of cooperation between them, even in times of tension. Such collaboration was anyhow common in matters such as the ransoming of captives and the extension of financial support to the Jewish community of Jerusalem³⁹. As a rule the Jewish communities of the Empire enjoyed a large degree of autonomy, and the authorities abstained from interfering in their internal life or in religious controversies. However, the serious disturbances generated by the calendar feud in Constantinople had clearly amounted to a breach of public law and order, which prompted the government to depart from its traditional policy in two ways. First, it imposed a fine on a section only of the local Jewish community. Secondly, since the tension between Rabbanites and Karaites ran high, it appears most unlikely that they should have reached by themselves an agreement about the construction of a wall separating their respective residences. Rather, it would seem that, exceptionally, the imperial authorities intervened in the affairs of the community and imposed the building of the partition. This step conformed with their general policy, aimed at the preservation of peace and tranquillity in the Empire's capital.

The concentration of all the Jews of Constantinople in Pera accounts for the magnitude of the catastrophe that befell them at the time of the Fourth Crusade. After capturing the tower

³³ Trans. and discussion in Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 192-193, no. 136.

³⁴ Russian merchants also visited Constantinople later, in the 1160s, according to Benjamin of Tudela: BT, Hebrew, p. 14; trans., p. 12.

³⁵ On these restrictions in time, place and movement in the city, see above, n. 31.

³⁶ See above, n. 3.

³⁷ D. A. Chrestides (ed.), Μαρκανά ανέκδοτα. 'Ανάχαρσις ἢ 'Ανανίας. 2. 'Επιστολές - Σιγίλλιο, (Thessalonike, 1984), p. 259, lines 938-939; for the dating, see pp. 45-47.

³⁸ BT, Hebrew, pp. 13 and 16; trans, pp. 11 and 14. Benjamin had high regard for the *parnas* in Constantinople, which implies that the latter was indeed a Rabbanite. See also Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," p. 184. Jewish taxation in Byzantium remains a vexed question; see the latest treatment by S. B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204-1453*, (University of Alabama, 1985), pp. 41-48.

³⁹ Letter of 1028 from both congregations in Alexandria about captives from Byzantine Attaleia: ed. A. Cowley, "Bodleian Genizah Fragments, IV," *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 19 (1906), pp. 251-254, and trans. by Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire*, pp. 190-191, no. 132; common campaign for Jerusalem: Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, vol. 2, pp. 96, 472.

of Pera in July 1203, the crusaders set fire to the suburb. The Jewish quarter was entirely destroyed⁴⁰, and there is good reason to believe that the surviving Jews left the area and settled elsewhere⁴¹. Pera was still sparsely populated in the early 1260s, and this surely facilitated its partial grant to Genoa by Emperor Michael VIII Palaeologos in 1267 and the settlement of the new Genoese quarter, which began shortly afterwards. In 1303 Andronikos II bestowed an additional section of Pera upon Genoa⁴². At the request of the Genoese, Michael VIII was supposed to remove to Constantinople all the Greeks residing in the territory he had allotted, yet some of them remained there⁴³. There is no evidence of a similar removal of Jews from the site, nor are Jews attested in Pera up to the 1390s, although the Genoese quarter included the area in which the Jews had lived prior to the Fourth Crusade. It is impossible to determine since when a *contratta Judeorum* existed within the Genoese quarter. Yet its Jewish residents either were newcomers or the descendants of immigrants attracted by the intense economic activity of this quarter and wishing to enjoy the benefits deriving from settlement in it. As implied by their Greek names, some of these Jews, if not most of them, hailed from Byzantine or from former Byzantine territories such as Chios⁴⁴. In short, there was no Jewish residential continuity in Pera from the early thirteenth to the late, or at any rate to the mid-fourteenth century⁴⁵.

One of the Western chroniclers recording the destruction of the Jewish quarter of Pera in 1203 claimed that the Jews had perished in the fire of 1203⁴⁶. This is clearly an overstatement. It is flatly contradicted by the overlooked testimony mentioned at the beginning of this paper, at present the only known one bearing on the Jews of Constantinople in the Latin period⁴⁷. Soon after the Latin conquest of the city, Pope Innocent III sent Benedict Cardinal of Santa Susanna as his legate to conduct talks and reach an accommodation with the Greek Church. Benedict left Rome for Constantinople late in May or early in June 1205, and apparently returned there by the summer of 1207. His stay in Constantinople lasted from November 1205 to January 1207. Either on his journey to the city, on his return voyage, or on both occasions he stopped for some time at Athens, Thebes and Thessalonike, three cities in which he held disputations with Greek clerics and theologians. Benedict was accompanied by Nicholas of Otranto, who served as his interpreter and may already have been then a monk at the Greek monastery of Casole (Terra d'Otranto), subject to papal authority⁴⁸. Nicholas became abbot of this monastery in 1219 or 1220⁴⁹. Some years later, between 1220 and 1223, he completed a long polemical work entitled *Διάλεξις κατὰ Ἰουδαίων*, or "Discourse against the

⁴⁰ See above, n. 5.

⁴¹ This last point is discussed below.

⁴² On the quarter, see Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, pp. 50-51, 113-114, 181-198.

⁴³ See Jacoby, "Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin," p. 253.

⁴⁴ See Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, pp. 277-279, 350, who lists Jewish men and women with Greek names; also Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," pp. 215-216. On economic motivation to settlement in Constantinople, see Jacoby, "Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin," pp. 260-261, and 278, n. 73.

⁴⁵ Contra Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, pp. 277-278; see also Jacoby, "Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin," p. 278, n. 72. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, p. 52, wrongly assumes the existence of a Genoese quarter in Pera at the time of the Fourth Crusade, when it was still located within the city proper: see Balard, *ibid.*, vol. 1, pp. 108-112.

⁴⁶ L. de Mas Latrie (ed.), *Chronique d'Ernoul et de Bernard le Trésorier*, (Paris, 1871), p. 366: there "the Jews lived, before they were burned" (*li Juifs manoient devant qu'ils fussent ars*).

⁴⁷ In a previous study, I mistakenly assumed that no such source existed: see Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," pp. 188-189. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, pp. 52, 60, has followed me in this respect, although he used the anti-Jewish work in which the testimony appears in another context, without being aware of its important implications for the issue discussed here: see *ibid.*, pp. 32-33.

⁴⁸ See J. M. Hoeck und R. J. Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto Abt von Casole. Beiträge zur Geschichte der ost-westlichen Beziehungen unter Innozenz III. und Friedrich II.*, (Ettal, 1965), pp. 30-35, 52-54.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 28.

Jews”⁵⁰. In it he claims to have gained considerable knowledge about the Jews and their creed by conducting with them disputations, in which his knowledge of Hebrew served him well⁵¹. Nicholas reports that in Constantinople, Thessalonike and Thebes (fol. 22v, 85v) he debated theological questions with both parts of the Jewry, in other words with Rabbanites and Karaites: εἶδον κἀν (sic) ἐν Κονσταντινούπολει τὰ ἄμφω μέρους διαλεγόμενα καὶ ἐν Θεσσαλονίκῃ καὶ Βοιωτίᾳ. At one point he asked a Jewish opponent whether he belonged to the “heresy” of the Rabbanites or that of the Karaites, τῶν ῥαββανιτῶν ἢ τῶν λεγομένων καρρανιτῶν (sic). He illustrates the distinction between the two groups by some points of contention between them (fol. 22v).

The information which Nicholas of Otranto incidentally offers about these groups in three major Byzantine cities is trustworthy. Indeed, the reference to the two congregations and the tension between them recalls Benjamin of Tudela’s description of the Jewry of Constantinople⁵². The evidence supplied by Nicholas is also of particular importance because it reflects the existence of a Jewish community in this city in the years 1205-1207, thus shortly after the destruction of the Jewish quarter of Pera. It is hardly plausible that Byzantine Jews should have immigrated to Constantinople from the provinces soon after the Latin conquest of 1204. They would have refrained from taking this step due to the widespread destruction in the city, its depopulation, and the severe economic contraction generated by the combination of these two factors. Moreover, the prospect that, as Jews, they would be subjected to harsher conditions under Latin rule than under Byzantine dominion must have also served as a deterrent. We may safely assume, therefore, that the Rabbanites and Karaites whom Nicholas encountered in Constantinople were not newcomers, but local Jews who had outlived the destruction of their quarter in 1203 and had decided to remain in the city⁵³. The coexistence of the two congregations clearly perpetuated the situation existing in the Komnenan period. Yet the physical continuity of the Jewish community and its two groups in Constantinople in the period of transition from Byzantine to Latin rule did not necessarily entail residential continuity. Unfortunately, Nicholas of Otranto does not reveal whether all the Jews of Constantinople were concentrated within a specific urban area, which seems likely, nor does he record where they lived at the time of his sojourn in the city from 1205 to 1207. Several factors, though, suggest that they had left Pera for Constantinople proper.

The fire which destroyed the Jewish quarter of Pera must have also inflicted heavy damage upon Greek houses in the vicinity. It appears rather unlikely, though, that the suburb should have been rebuilt in the period of Latin rule⁵⁴. In addition to Pera, Constantinople proper also suffered from depopulation, since the large Greek exodus that followed the city’s conquest in 1204 was not compensated by the rather limited influx of Latin immigrants⁵⁵. Despite the heavy

⁵⁰ Preserved in a fourteenth century copy: ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, gr. 1255. On dating and content, see Hoeck und Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 82-88, and E. Patlagean, “La ‘Dispute avec les Juifs’ de Nicolas d’Otrante (vers 1220) et la question du Messie,” in M. G. Muzzarelli, G. Todeschini (eds.), *La storia degli Ebrei nell’Italia meridionale: tra filologia e metodologia, Istituto per i beni culturali naturali della regione Emilia-Romagna, Documenti/29*, (1990), pp. 19-27.

⁵¹ On which see Hoeck und Loenertz, *Nikolaos-Nektarios von Otranto*, pp. 23, 87; Patlagean, “La ‘Dispute avec les Juifs,’” p. 22.

⁵² Nicholas is the only source documenting the presence of Karaites in Thessalonike and Thebes, if the calendar feud examined above indeed occurred in Constantinople, as I firmly believe.

⁵³ On others who apparently left the city, see below, n. 59.

⁵⁴ This would also explain why it was sparsely inhabited in the 1260s: see above, p. 7.

⁵⁵ Nicetas Choniates, *Historia*, ed. I. A. van Dieten, (Berlin 1975), pp. 593-594, on the bad reception given to refugees in Thrace. On those at Nicaea, in Paphlagonia and in the Turkish territories of Anatolia, see M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204-1261)*, (Oxford, 1975), pp. 10-11; idem, “The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204-1227),” *ibid.*, p. 46, on the flight of the Greek clergy. The last two studies are reproduced in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks*

destruction caused by the fires of 1203 and 1204⁵⁶, there were surely numerous abandoned houses in the city in which those who had lost their homes could resettle. The Jews appear to have adopted this solution, an assumption supported to some extent by the location of the Jewish quarter in the city proper in the early Palaiologan period. The Arab chronicler al-Jazari is the first to mention this new Jewish quarter. In 1293 he met in Damascus an Arab merchant who had lived in Constantinople for twelve years and reported the existence of a Jewish and a Muslim quarter, each of which was enclosed by a wall⁵⁷. The chronicler failed to specify, though, whether the Jewish quarter already existed in 1281, at the time of the merchant's arrival in the city. In any event, from a letter written by the humanist Maximos Planoudes shortly after 1296 and other sources we may gather that it was situated at Vlanga, an area in the southern part of the city close to the harbor of Kontoskalion⁵⁸. Planoudes explicitly refers to the Jewish tanners established in this quarter, who recall those whom Benjamin of Tudela had encountered in Pera in the early 1160s⁵⁹.

In the absence of reliable evidence, the date at which the Jews of Pera or their descendants settled in Vlanga remains a matter of speculation. This move may have already taken place spontaneously shortly after the events of 1203-1204. It appears more likely, though, that it was Michael VIII who established the Jewish tanners in this area. After recovering Constantinople in 1261, he allowed the Genoese, the Pisans and the Venetians to resettle in their old quarters and, in 1267, enforced the relocation of the Genoese in Pera⁶⁰. It stands to reason, therefore, that he also resumed the traditional imperial policy of residential segregation imposed upon the Jews and the Muslims and assigned to each of these groups a specific quarter, which was later surrounded by a wall. It is a fair guess that ecological considerations determined his choice of Vlanga for the Jews. Because of the evil smell deriving from tanning, it was customary in the Middle Ages to remove the exercise of the craft beyond the city wall or, at any rate, to sparsely populated urban areas. Vlanga was an appropriate location in this respect, particularly since the neighboring harbor of Kontoskalion could serve as a sewer for the dirty waters which the tanners spilled⁶¹. The settlement of the Jewish tanners eventually determined the site at which all the Byzantine Jews of Constantinople would live in the Palaiologan period. Such an imperial ini-

in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204, (London, 1989), with identical pagination. On repopulation after 1261, see D. G. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282. A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*, (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), pp. 114, 122-123, 131-135; K.-P. Matschke, "Grund- und Hauseigentum in und um Konstantinopel in späbyzantinischer Zeit," *Jahrbuch für Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 1984, vol. 4, pp. 106-109. The number of Latins settling in Constantinople after 1204 cannot be established, yet it must have remained small. In 1261 some 3,000 Latins fled the city, a figure that presumably included a majority of the settlers as well as travelling merchants who happened to be there at the time of the Byzantine reconquest.

⁵⁶ On which see T. F. Madden, "The Fires of the Fourth Crusade in Constantinople, 1203-1204: a Damage Assessment," *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 84/85 (1991/1992), pp. 72-93.

⁵⁷ Trans. by M. Izzedin, "Un texte arabe inédit sur Constantinople byzantine," *Journal asiatique*, 246 (1958), pp. 454-455.

⁵⁸ P. A. M. Leone (ed.), *Maximi monachi Planudis epistulae*, (Amsterdam, 1991), p. 64, lines 10-18, no. 31, and see Jacoby, "Les quartiers juifs," pp. 189-196. On the harbor, see R. Guiland, "Les ports de Byzance sur la Propontide," *Byzantion*, 23 (1953), pp. 196-202, repr. in idem, *Etudes de topographie de Constantinople byzantine*, (Berlin, Amsterdam, 1969), vol. 2, pp. 88-91.

⁵⁹ The presence of these craftsmen in Constantinople both in the Komnenan and the Palaiologan period does not necessarily point to a continuous Jewish presence in the city, since some of them may have arrived there after 1261: see below. It is noteworthy that, by contrast to the tanners, the Jewish silk workers mentioned by Benjamin of Tudela are not attested later. An explanation for their absence from the city is offered in D. Jacoby, "The Jews and the Silk Industry of Constantinople," in A. Lambropoulou (ed.), 'Η 'Εβραϊκή παρουσία στον έλλαδικό χώρο, 4ο-19ο αιώνας, (Athens, 1995) (in press). *

⁶⁰ See Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West*, pp. 133-134. Venice resumed authority over its quarter only after the ratification of its treaty of 1268 with the Empire: see ibid., pp. 214-216. On the background of the Genoese relocation, see Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, vol. 1, pp. 49-51.

⁶¹ As suggested by Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, p. 55. This harbor was restored by Emperor Michael VIII: see Guiland, as above, n. 58.

tiative would have also conformed with the emperor's general demographic and economic policy. Indeed, Michael VIII took various measures to repopulate the city and enhance its economic activity. It is quite possible, therefore, that he also promoted Jewish migration from the provinces, in particular that of craftsmen⁶². In any event, a spontaneous migration of that type took place at a later period⁶³.

Our latest considerations further narrow the chronological gap between Nicholas of Otranto's testimony and al-Jazari's description, which at best hints at the existence of the Jewish quarter in 1281. We are still left with a period of several decades, from 1205-1207 to the 1260s, for which we lack both direct and indirect information about the Jews of Constantinople. We may nevertheless conclude that while the city's Jewish community was severely affected by the Fourth Crusade, it survived through the years of Latin rule, and the same holds true of the Rabbanite and Karaite congregations in its midst. Yet the presence of Venice and Genoa in Constantinople in the Palaiologan period introduced an additional division of the Jewish population, along "national" lines. It generated the emergence of two more Jewish communities and residential areas, located in the respective quarters of these maritime powers⁶⁴.

⁶² On repopulation, see above, n. 55. On the economic aspect of this policy, see Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland," pp. 228-229.

⁶³ See D. Jacoby, "Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Romanie du XIII^e au milieu du XV^e siècle," *Travaux et mémoires*, 8 (1981), pp. 227-228, 230-231, repr. in idem, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion*, (Northampton, 1989), no. 9; also idem, "Les Génois dans l'Empire byzantin," p. 260.

⁶⁴ On this development, which is beyond the scope of the present study, see Jacoby, "The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland," pp. 229-230.

THE VENETIAN PRESENCE IN THE LATIN EMPIRE OF CONSTANTINOPLE (1204–1261): THE CHALLENGE OF FEUDALISM AND THE BYZANTINE INHERITANCE

Venice played a decisive role in the Fourth Crusade and in the establishment of the Latin Empire of Constantinople¹. It provided maritime transportation and naval support for the crusader armies, and its forces actively participated in the conquest of the Byzantine capital. During the crusade, in the purely military phase of the association between Venice and the “French” crusaders, each large contingent operated independently under its own commander, yet decisions regarding common political and military issues were reached by the assembled leaders². However, in March 1204, a month or so before the final conquest of the Byzantine

¹ The latest scholarly work exclusively devoted to the Fourth Crusade, with an extensive listing of previous studies, is by D. E. QUELLER, *The Fourth Crusade. The Conquest of Constantinople, 1201–1204*. Philadelphia 1977. On the crusade and the Latin Empire, see J. LONGNON, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée*. Paris 1949, with abundant references to the sources; E. H. MCNEAL and R. L. WOLFF, *The Fourth Crusade*, in: K. M. SETTON (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*. Madison, Wisconsin 1969–1990, II 153–185, and R. L. WOLFF, *The Latin Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1261*, *ibid.*, II 187–233, the latter repr. in *idem*, *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople*. London 1976, no. I; D. M. NICOL, *The Fourth Crusade and the Greek and Latin Empires, 1204–1261*, in: J. M. HUSSEY (ed.), *The Cambridge Medieval History*, IV/1, *The Byzantine Empire*. Cambridge 1966, 275–330; *idem*, *Byzantium and Venice. A Study in Diplomatic and Cultural Relations*. Cambridge 1988, 124–187. A. CARLE, *Per una storia dell'Impero Latino di Costantinopoli (1204–1261)*. Seconda edizione ampliata. Bologna 1978, does not proceed beyond 1208 in his survey of the political and ecclesiastical history of the Empire, yet deals extensively with social aspects. On the Venetians in particular in the Latin Empire, see S. BORSARI, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo*. Napoli 1966, *passim*; L. BUENGER ROBERT, *Venice and the Crusades*, in: SETTON, *A History of the Crusades*, V 432–438. For the general background and specific events the reader should consult these works, to which I shall refer only when absolutely necessary. For the documentary evidence, see also B. HENDRICKX, *Régestes des empereurs latins de Constantinople (1204–1261/1272)*. *Byzantina* 14 (1988), 7–221, also published as a separate volume by the Κέντρον Βυζαντινῶν Ἑρευνῶν. Θεσσαλονίκη 1988.

² The French chronicles speak of *Frans* and the Latin sources of *Franci* and *Francigeni*, despite the participation of crusaders hailing from areas other than the Capetian Kingdom.

capital, the leaders' relations reached a critical turning-point: they had to devise the transition from a military force on the move to a political body resting upon a territorial base and a settled population. The five major issues raised in the treaty they signed at this juncture were the election of the Latin emperor, the political regime of the Empire, the partition of Romania's territory, the military service owed by fiefholders to the emperor and, finally, the election of the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople as well as other ecclesiastical matters³.

Venice's involvement in the crusade was prompted by economic interests and generated territorial, political, commercial and ecclesiastical benefits, which have been repeatedly explored. However, various important aspects of the Venetian presence in the Latin Empire have been neglected. The election of the emperor entailed Venice's subordination to a feudal leader in the Empire's framework. It also led to the integration of the Venetian state and its dependents within a feudal institutional network totally alien to Venice's own social structure, political system and mentality. How, then, did Venice respond to these challenges, which involved both conceptual and structural adjustments on its part, and what were the practical solutions it adopted? How did it deal with its portion of the Empire, and what was its attitude toward the Byzantine inheritance it encountered? The answers to these questions are crucial for an understanding of Venice's position and policies in the Latin Empire and the Commune's relationship with its own fiefholders. All these subjects will be examined, with the help of unpublished notarial documents, in the larger context of Venice's expansion in the eastern Mediterranean⁴.

The Venetians in the Latin Empire: the political and constitutional context

The treaty of March 1204 virtually constituted the foundation charter of the Latin Empire, as it determined the procedure to be followed for the election of the Latin emperor. Venice named six of the twelve members of

³ The five issues are not enumerated here in the same order as in the charters; the last one does not concern us in this study. Each of the parties issued a charter to the other: G. L. FR. TAFEL and G. M. THOMAS (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*. Wien 1856–1857 [hereafter: *TTH*], I 445–452; critical edition of the charter of the crusader leaders by W. PREVENIER, *De oorkonden der graven van Vlaanderen (1191 – aanvang 1206)* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Commission Royale d'Histoire, *Recueil des actes des princes belges*, 5). Bruxelles 1964–1971, II, *Uitgave* 553–559, No. 267, repr. in CARILE, *Per una storia* 265–268. I shall refer below to the more easily available edition by *TTH*.

⁴ The documents are preserved at the Archivio di Stato in Venice [hereafter: ASV].

the electoral commission. Theoretically the doge could also be elected emperor, yet there is every reason to believe that the Venetians never contemplated such an outcome, because of the heavy drain on their resources that the emperorship and the defence of the Empire would have entailed. Instead, they preferred to secure the election of a Venetian as Patriarch of Constantinople by introducing in the treaty a clause enabling them to achieve this goal. In the emperor's election, therefore, the Venetian electors cast their decisive vote in favour of a baron: Baldwin IX of Flanders, and VI of Hainaut, was elected emperor on 9 May 1204⁵. At his coronation, which took place a week later, various trappings recalling Byzantine coronations appeared. The Byzantine imprint in the Latin Empire was also reflected later by the use of titles, the court ceremonial, as well as by documents and coins issued by the Latin emperors⁶. The adoption of these features partly derived from the Latins' desire to emphasize the continuity of imperial tradition and to lend thereby legitimacy to their own rule. More pronounced continuity is illustrated by the survival in the Latin Empire of Byzantine administrative and fiscal institutions and practices, as well as by the persistence of Byzantine law and social structures both in the rural world in general and in cities ruled by Greeks, in particular⁷.

⁵ See WOLFF, *The Latin Empire* 189, n. 2, for another, later Venetian tradition according to which the Venetians first voted for the doge, yet on the second ballot one of them elected Baldwin, precisely in order to save Venice from assuming the defence of the Empire on her own.

⁶ On the mixture of Byzantine and western elements, see LONGNON, *L'Empire latin* 51–53, 129–130; B. HENDRICKX, *Οἱ πολιτικοὶ καὶ στρατιωτικοὶ θεσμοὶ τῆς Λατινικῆς Αὐτοκρατορίας τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως κατὰ τοὺς πρώτους χρόνους τῆς ὑπάρξεώς της*. Thessalonike, 1970; idem, *Les institutions de l'Empire latin de Constantinople (1204–1261): le pouvoir impérial* (L'empereur, les régents, l'impératrice). *Byzantina* 6 (1974) 85–154; and, more convincingly, CARILE, *Per una storia* 324–361, but his remark that the adoption of Byzantine “external” elements by the “boorish” Latins amounted to kitsch (p. 343) is rather odd. See lately W. PREVENIER, *La chancellerie de l'Empire latin de Constantinople (1204–1261)*, in V. D. VAN AALST/K. N. CIGGAAR (eds.), *The Latin Empire. Some Contributions*. Hernen [The Netherlands] 1990, 63–81, on the charters of the Latin emperors; the author argues against the presence of Greeks in the chancery, which nevertheless is all the more likely because Greek officers also served in the fiscal administration established by the Latins: see below, 171. On the adoption of Byzantine elements by the Venetians, see below.

⁷ For Latin Romania in general, see D. JACOBY, *From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change*. *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989) 6–23; this issue of the journal has also been published as a separate volume, with identical pagination: B. ARBEL, B. HAMILTON, D. JACOBY (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*. London 1989. On cities, see for example the case of Adrianople, ruled by Theodore Branas since 1206: below, 151.

It has been argued that, in fact, Byzantium had already become "feudalized" prior to the Fourth Crusade⁸. This would imply that the political and social fabric of the regions of Romania conquered and subsequently ruled by western knights, including the Latin Empire, remained basically unaffected by the events of 1204, except for the imposition of a feudal "superstructure" and the substitution of the Byzantine élite by a Latin élite. One may detect, however, some fundamental changes following the importation of the western feudal regime based on a hierarchy of vassal ties and fiefs entailing military service, the decentralization of political authority and, finally, the overall privatization of state prerogatives in judicial and fiscal matters. The last two processes in particular had far reaching social implications for the indigenous society⁹.

The provisions adopted in March 1204 moulded to a large extent the Latin Empire's political and social regime¹⁰. The western traditions brought to Romania by the leaders of non-Venetian contingents as well as pressing military needs were dominant factors in this respect, and a strong link was established at the outset between the holding of fiefs and the obligation of military service, sanctioned by an oath of fealty to the lord. In the Latin Empire, specifically, each fiefholder would swear to render service to the emperor¹¹. For the "French" knights among the crusaders the transition deriving from the treaty, the conquest and the distribution of fiefs must have been rather smooth: it merely implied the territorialization and geographical extension of the personal hierarchy based on vassal ties that already existed during the crusade, and the recognition of the emperor as supreme lord. For Venice, on the other hand, this transition implied some important concessions and created a permanent association with unlikely partners. Admittedly, Doge Enrico Dandolo had no choice but to consent to the creation in the Latin Empire of a feudal network headed by the emperor, which the leaders of the "French" crusader contingents considered as self-evident. Yet, surpri-

⁸ Most recently by J. HALDON, *The Feudalism Debate Once More: The Case of Byzantium*. *Journal of Peasant Studies* 17/1 (October 1989) 5-40. The debate has been partly fueled by controversy about the precise meaning of the concept "feudalism" and by the Marxist interpretation of the western feudal regime as a mere "superstructure". For a view to the contrary, see next note.

⁹ See JACOBY, *From Byzantium*, especially 2-6, with reference to previous work on the subject.

¹⁰ For their text, see above, n. 3.

¹¹ This oath should not be confused with another one that all those remaining in the Latin Empire after the end of March 1205 would take, promising to uphold the treaty of March 1204.

singly, he also accepted the insertion within this network of Venice's fiefholders and of Venetian officers representing the state, who would swear to render to the emperor all the service owed by the portion allotted to Venice. Dandolo, however, was personally exempt from this oath¹². The doge's acquiescence was a matter of both necessity and convenience.

Feudal institutions, practices and terminology were unknown in the political and social fabric of Venice, a city ruled by a non-feudal élite imbued with a firm sense of statehood. Yet in the century preceding the Fourth Crusade Venice had become acquainted elsewhere with these feudal elements. Some Venetian individuals held feudal and other types of real estate on the Italian mainland or Terraferma, in the territories of Venice's neighbours, and their number was to increase substantially in the following century¹³. In the Kingdom of Jerusalem, on the other hand, it was the Commune's own portion of the city and countryside of Tyre, obtained in 1124 or somewhat later, that was firmly integrated within the feudal and military network created by the Frankish nobility after the First Crusade. In return for this property Venice owed the kings of Jerusalem the service of a number of horsemen. The Commune ensured this service by enfeoffing about half of its rural holdings in the area to Venetian individuals¹⁴. We shall see that Venice's adaptation to the feudal milieu in the lordship of Tyre in the period preceding the Fourth Crusade was particularly relevant to our inquiry.

It has been claimed that the Latin Empire was a "French"-Venetian condominium, yet this description does not reveal the complexity of

¹² TTH I 448–449, 452: the doge would not *ad aliqua servitia facienda iuramentum prestare propter aliquod datum vel feodum sive honorificenciam que vobis debeat assignari; tamen illi vel ille, quem vel quos loco vestro [Dandolo] statueritis super hijs que vobis fuerint assignata [sic], debeant iuramento teneri ad omne servitium imperatori et imperio faciendum*. The issue is obviously not fiefs given personally to the doge or to Venetian officers.

¹³ Recent studies for this period are by M. Pozza, *Mercanti e proprietari. Il possesso fondiario veneziano in terraferma* (secc. XIII–XIV). Tesi di laurea, Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Venezia, 1979–80, esp. I 58–236; idem, I Badoer. *Una famiglia veneziana dal X al XIII secolo*. Abano Terme 1982, esp. 60–68; I. Fees, *Reichtum und Macht im mittelalterlichen Venedig. Die Familie Ziani* (*Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom* 68). Tübingen 1988, 176–193; G. Rösch, *La nobiltà veneziana nel duecento tra Venezia e la Marca*, in: G. Ortalli e M. Knapton (eds.), *Istituzioni, società e potere nella marca trevigiana e veronese* (secoli XIII–XIV). Sulle tracce di G. B. Verci (*Istituto storico italiano per il medio evo, Studi storici* 199–200). Roma 1988 263–270; L. A. Ling, *La presenza fondiaria veneziana nel padovano* (secoli XII–XIV), *ibid.* 305–310.

¹⁴ See J. Prawer, *Crusader Institutions*. Oxford 1980, 146–150; O. Berggötz, *Der Bericht des Marsilio Zorzi. Codex Querini-Stampalia IV 3 (1064)* (*Kieler Werkstücke, Reihe C: Beiträge zur europäischen Geschichte des frühen und hohen Mittelalters*, herausgegeben von H. E. Mayer 2). Frankfurt am Main 1990, 71–75, and see 52–54.

Venice's position in the Empire, which combined elements of subordination and equality. Formally Venice's insertion within the feudal system of government of the Latin Empire entailed subordination to the emperor at two different levels, one collectively as a political body and the other individually, with respect to Venice's fiefholders. Yet, on the other hand, the decisive Venetian contribution to the crusade ensured Doge Enrico Dandolo, as representative of the Venetian Commune, a standing equal to that of the feudal lords heading the main "French" contingents prior to the conquest of Constantinople. This standing was translated into parity between Venice and the barons in the joint commission appointed in March 1204, which dealt with the political and social structure of the Latin Empire and determined the general principles of its territorial division, and again in the electoral body that chose the emperor. Venice's economic and maritime power, indispensable for the survival of the Latin Empire, ensured the perpetuation of parity between the Commune and the emperors in subsequent years. Significantly, as late as 1231 the documents recording the various agreements between them were not issued in the form of imperial concessions, but as bi-lateral treaties between parties of equal standing swearing to each other to uphold their mutual obligations¹⁵.

In the years 1204–1207 Doge Enrico Dandolo and his successor in the Empire, the Venetian podestà at Constantinople Marino Zeno, also managed to consolidate the principle of parity within the institutional fabric of the Latin Empire and in the operation of the latter's decision-making bodies, as illustrated by the successive joint commissions that were created. One of these devised in the autumn of 1204 the detailed partition of several Byzantine provinces; in August 1206 or somewhat later another one attributed disputed villages in the Gallipoli peninsula¹⁶.

¹⁵ CARILE, *Per la storia* 349–351, has rightly drawn attention to this last point. Apparently no treaties between the two parties were concluded between 1231 and 1261.

¹⁶ The text of the partition of 1204 was first edited in *TTH* I 464–488, but see the new edition with introduction and extensive commentary by A. CARILE, *Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae. Studi veneziani* 7 (1965–1966) 125–305. N. OIKONOMIDES, *La décomposition de l'Empire byzantin de 1204 et les origines de l'Empire de Nicée: à propos de la "Partitio Romaniae"*, in: *XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines (Athènes, 1976)*. Athènes 1976, *Rapports et co-rapports*, I/1, 3–22, has suggested a new dating in April or May 1204, which is not convincing and has been criticized by CARILE, *Per la storia* 322–324. The charter dealing with the Gallipoli peninsula appears in J. LONGNON, *Recherches sur la vie de Geoffroy de Villehardouin suivies du catalogue des actes des Villehardouin*. Paris 1939, 201–202, no. 83. Note the following: *ista casalia (. . .) debeant dominari a Venetis tenentibus Gallipoli et ejus pertinentia*, and similar formulae for other groups of villages

These commissions, which fulfilled important functions and whose decisions affected the long-range development of the Latin Empire, were dissolved once they had carried out their mandate. Such was not the case, however, with the mixed council established in October 1205 by Henry of Hainaut, acting as regent of the Empire, and Marino Zeno, representing the Venetian party. This council, composed of the barons on the one hand, the podestà and his six councillors, on the other, was to advise the emperor on all matters pertaining to the military service to which he was entitled and appoint mixed courts to settle disputes between him and the fiefholders¹⁷. In March 1207 the same joint council established another mixed court in charge of disputes between Venetians and non-Venetians concerning movable property¹⁸. From a Venetian perspective, the creation of the permanent joint council in October 1205 was a decisive achievement: in fact, though not in name, it was a feudal court headed by the emperor, of which the Venetian component was an integral part. The institutionalization of Venetian participation in the deliberations of this body sanctioned both Venice's constitutional role in the government of the Empire and its collective integration, as a state, within the latter's feudal fabric. There was no precedent for such an accommodation, and its novelty must have struck Venetians and feudal lords alike. Both parties, yet Venice in particular, demonstrated thereby a remarkable degree of pragmatism in dealing with their mutual relations. In the Kingdom of Jerusalem, where the Commune's property was inserted within the feudal network, as noted above, neither Venice nor any other maritime power ever achieved a similar standing in the High Court¹⁹.

The combination of subordination and parity achieved by Venice within the institutional framework of the Empire was extended and amplified on a symbolic level. Since his election in June 1205 Marino Zeno assumed the title *Dei gratia Venetorum potestas in Romania, ejusdem imperii quarte partis et dimidie dominator*, which defined the territorial

ascribed either to Venetian or "French" fiefholders; for the geographical distribution of the villages, see the map in CARILE, *Partitio*, opposite 160.

¹⁷ *TTH* I 571–574. On the functions of the podestà and his council, the latter modelled on the Minor Consiglio assisting the doge in Venice, see R. L. WOLFF, *A New Document from the Period of the Latin Empire of Constantinople: The Oath of the Venetian Podestà. Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 12 (1952) (Mélanges Henri Grégoire, IV) 553–556, repr. in idem, *Studies in the Latin Empire*, no. VI.

¹⁸ *TTH* II 49–52. On another, formal aspect of imperial-Venetian parity, see below.

¹⁹ See D. JACOBY, *The Kingdom of Jerusalem and the Collapse of Hohenstaufen Power in the Levant. DOP* 40 (1986) 99–100, repr. in idem, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion*. Northampton 1989, no. III.

extent of his authority. Particular attention has been devoted to Zeno's use of *dominator*, equivalent to the Byzantine title *despotes*, which was also used by Zeno's successors, and to his agreement of October 1205 with Henry of Hainaut, to which like Henry he apposed his own signature in red ink. The use of these regalian elements has been explained as an assertion of autonomy vis-à-vis the doge, enhanced by the podestà's integration within the hierarchy of the Empire, from which he derived his title of *dominator* or *despotes*²⁰. These arguments may be safely dismissed in view of two considerations. First, there is no evidence that either of these titles was ever conferred upon Marino Zeno by Henry of Hainaut, nor is it plausible that this should have been the case; the same holds true with regard to their respective successors. Secondly, the contemporary use of *despotes* was somewhat ambiguous. Once synonym in Byzantium with the imperial title *basileus*, it began some time before 1163 to designate the highest ranks in the imperial hierarchy, second only to the emperor himself or the co-emperor, and was granted to the heir presumptive to the throne or some of the emperor's close relatives, like their sons-in-law²¹. Nevertheless, it continued after that date to appear in imperial letters and on imperial seals, in conformity with a long-standing Byzantine tradition. Such was the case both prior to the Fourth Crusade, as on the seals of Alexios III Angelus, and after the disappearance of the Latin Empire, as on those of Michael VIII Palaeologus²². Similarly, in the Latin Empire *despotes* served as an imperial title on the seals of Baldwin I, Henry of Hainaut, Robert of Courtenay and Baldwin II²³. This fact sheds a particular light on Zeno's own use of the title. It suggests a formal affirmation of parity or quasi-parity directed toward the holder of the imperial office in the Latin Empire, rather than an expression of autonomy with respect to the doge. A similar picture emerges from

²⁰ *TTH* I 559, 567, 571, respectively 29 June, 29 September and October 1205, and see above, 147. On the use of *despotes* by Zeno's successors, see in particular BORSARI, *Studi*, p. 89, n. 14.

²¹ See R. GUILLAND, *Etudes sur l'histoire administrative de l'Empire byzantin. Le despote, ὁ δεσπότης*. *REB* 17 (1959) 52–89, repr. in idem, *Recherches sur les institutions byzantines*. Berlin–Amsterdam 1967, II 1–24; B. FERJANČIĆ, *Despoti u Vizantiji i juznoslovenskim zemljama* (= Die Despoten in Byzanz und den südslavischen Ländern). Beograd 1960, 3–48 [German summary on pp. 209–212]; A. FAILLER, *Les insignes et la signature du despote*. *REB* 40 (1982) 171–186; *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A. P. KAZHDAN et al. Oxford 1991 [hereafter: *ODB*], s. v. "Despotes".

²² See G. ZACOS and A. VEGLERY, *Byzantine Lead Seals*. Basel 1972, I/1, 98–100, nos. 109–110; 111–113, nos. 120–121 bis.

²³ See *ibid.* 102–104, nos. 112–114, and G. SCHLUMBERGER, F. CHALANDON, A. BLANCHET, *Sigillographie de l'Orient latin*. Paris 1943, 165–169, nos. 1–8; 170–172, nos. 11–16.

Zeno's signing of the agreement of October 1205 in red ink, like Henry of Hainaut, and from the wearing of a red *kampagion* or sandal on his right foot. According to Byzantine tradition, the use of *kampagia* on both feet was an exclusive imperial prerogative; this tradition was adopted by the Latin emperor²⁴.

The Venetian portion of the Empire

The treaty of March 1204 determined the portions of Byzantium allocated respectively to the emperor, the members of the feudal armies and Venice, which was to receive three-eighths of Constantinople and the territories of Romania²⁵. The detailed division was devised in the following autumn by a new joint Venetian-“French” commission. This body relied on registers found in Constantinople, which listed the revenues accruing from yearly taxes apparently collected in September 1203 by the Byzantine imperial fisc. On the other hand, it omitted other areas from the document which it produced, the *Partitio terrarum imperii Romaniae*²⁶. The commission's decisions did not prevent some important territorial changes in the distribution of land at a later stage, such as the

²⁴ The wearing of a red sandal is reported in R. CESSI/F. BENNATO (eds.), *Venetiarum Historia* vulgo Petro Iustiniano Iustiniani filio adiudicata. Venezia 1964, 145: *Et quia imperator Constantinopolitanus gerebat in pedibus stivalos rubeos secundum morem Grecorum antiquitus observatum, sic iste primus potestas pro parte imperii tangente ducatu Venetorum stivalum unum rubeum in pede dextro incepit gerere cum honore*. The reference is to 1205; we do not know, however, whether Zeno's successors followed his example. The chronicle just mentioned, dated to 1358, is an abbreviated version of a thirteenth century work: see A. CARILE, *La chronachistica veneziana (secoli XIII–XVI) di fronte alla spartizione della Romania nel 1204*. Firenze 1969, 38–45. The function of the red sandals as imperial insignia was well illustrated in 989: Emperor Basil II refused to accept the submission of Bardas Skleros, who had revolted against him, until the latter had taken off the red sandals he wore; MICHEL PSELLOS, *Chronographie ou histoire d'un siècle de Byzance (976–1077)*, ed. E. RENAULD. Paris 1926, I 16–17, para. XXVII.

²⁵ See above, n. 3.

²⁶ This new title has been suggested by CARILE, instead of the customary *Partitio Romaniae*; for the text, see above, n. 16. According to OIKONOMIDES, *La décomposition* 3–22, the commission used the fiscal returns of September 1203 which did not cover dissident provinces. This hypothesis does not explain, however, the omission of Constantinople and Crete, as noted by CARILE, *Per la storia* 323; on the other hand, I am not convinced by Carile's contention that the taxes of September 1203 could not have been properly recorded in Constantinople by the following spring because of the confused situation existing in the Empire. On the portions, see CARILE, *ibid.* 200–218, 383–392; for Venice in particular, see also BORSARI, *Studi* 15–17, 20–25, yet for the relations between Venice and the Venetian fiefholders, see below.

acquisition of Crete by Venice²⁷. The actual division of Constantinople, which was already in Latin hands, was carried out in the autumn of 1204, and Venice acquired then its full share of the city. It would be mistaken to assume, however, that henceforth the Commune's officers would exclusively or mostly be concerned with the government and administration of the Venetian quarter in Constantinople. The developments in the preceding seven months had enabled Venice to regain the political standing as well as the secular and ecclesiastical privileges it had enjoyed in Byzantium prior to the Fourth Crusade. Outside Constantinople, however, the recovery of Venetian assets had not yet been completed, as it depended on actual conquests still to be carried out²⁸. Venice's extensive interests called for vigorous action and permanent supervision by Doge Enrico Dandolo and the Venetian officers who succeeded him in Constantinople.

In Thrace the partition agreement of 1204 assigned to Venice the city of Adrianople and a strip of land linking it to the coastline running from Heraclea along the sea of Marmara almost as far as the southern tip of the Gallipoli peninsula²⁹. Venice took hold of Adrianople, occupied by Boniface of Montferrat, after reaching an agreement with him on 12 August 1204, yet lost the city in March of the following year, when its Greek inhabitants rebelled against Latin rule³⁰. Along the coast Venice obtained an area of major importance for the safeguard of navigation between the Mediterranean and Constantinople, which included the port of Rhaidestos or Rodosto, as the Italians called it. Until the arrest and expulsion of the Venetians by Emperor Manuel I Comnenus in 1171, Rodosto had been a major Venetian trading station both for passing vessels and the shipping of Thracian grain. It had then a permanent

²⁷ See OIKONOMIDES, *La décomposition* 5–8; S. BORSARI, *Il dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo*. Napoli 1963 11–13; idem, *Studi* 32–34.

²⁸ This recovery, whether on the basis of written documents or not, was explicitly mentioned in March 1204, confirmed in October 1205 and implicitly reiterated in August 1206: *TTH* I 446, 450, 573, and II 34–35. On Venice's standing in the Empire prior to the Fourth Crusade, see R.-J. LILIE, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)*. Amsterdam 1984 1–68, 103–115, and 325–612, *passim*; a more synthetic view is offered by S. BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici*. Venezia 1988.

²⁹ See CARILE, *Partitio* 160, and the map on the opposite page; 218–219, lines 26–43 (text), and 247–255 (commentary).

³⁰ *TTH* I 513–515: Venice acquired Crete by this agreement; on the Venetians in Adrianople, see VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. E. FARAL. Deuxième édition. Paris 1961, II, paras. 335–336.

nucleus of Venetian population and two churches belonging to the Benedictine monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice, one of which served as administrative center for the Venetian outpost³¹. We have no direct evidence that the Venetians settled anew in the city between 1171 and 1204, although this is likely to have been the case³². At any rate, it is obvious that at the time of the Fourth Crusade they were well acquainted with the coastal area, where their presence is recorded soon after the conquest of this region by Henry of Hainaut in November 1204. Venice held Rodosto by April 1205, yet abandoned the city in February 1206 under the pressure of the Vlacho-Bulgarian armies led by Tsar Ioannitsa, who had invaded the Latin Empire in the previous year³³. These forces and their Greek allies occupied virtually all the Venetian property in Thrace. After their withdrawal in the course of the same year Venice recovered most of its assets, yet ceded Adrianople to Theodore Branas, a powerful Greek *archon* who recognized Venetian lordship over the city while ensuring the latter's autonomy³⁴. In the Gallipoli peninsula imperial and Venetian officers could not agree about the precise boundaries of Venice's portion. The problem was eventually settled, in August 1206 or somewhat later, by a joint commission that collected oral evidence from the local population of the disputed villages³⁵.

It appears that the practical arrangements worked out between Venice and Emperor Baldwin of Flanders or his successor Henry of Hainaut were more complex than reflected by the *Partitio*. Indeed, Venice's portion in the Latin Empire did not only consist of territories registered in this document, but also included income from another source not men-

³¹ See LILIE, *Handel* 209–210; BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* 40 and 55, n. 115.

³² Giovanni Bon, formerly a resident of Rodosto, lived in Constantinople in October 1206: *TTH* II 43–45; ASV, *Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 13–14. It is impossible to determine whether he resided at Rodosto prior to 1204 or briefly in 1204–1205, before the Latins evacuated the city; on this event, see below.

³³ For the itinerary and dating of Henry's campaign, see VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête*, II, para. 310; NICETAS CHONIATES, *Historia*, ed. I.-A. VAN DIETEN (*CFHB*, XI/1). Berlin–New York 1975, 601–602.

³⁴ On the Bulgarian occupation and the recovery of Venetian territory, see LONGNON, *L'Empire latin* 77–87, and esp. BORSARI, *Studi* 32–34. On Adrianople, see *TTH* II, 18–19. The Branas had strong influence in the area and Theodore claimed to have inherited his position at the head of the city; his marriage to Agnes of France, formerly Byzantine empress (1180–1185), strengthened his standing: see J.-Cl. CHEYNET, *Pouvoir et contestation à Byzance* (963–1210). Paris 1990 435–440, 442, 470–471; M. ANGOLD, *Archons and Dynasts: Local Aristocracies and the Cities of the Later Byzantine Empire*, in idem (ed.), *The Byzantine Aristocracy* (B. A. R. International Series, 221). Oxford 1984, 244–245.

³⁵ See above, n. 16.

tioned in it and which, therefore, has practically remained unnoticed. In later years Venice and the emperor jointly held several undivided villages, the Commune receiving three-eighths of their income, in conformity with the treaty of March 1204. We have no information about the localities in which this arrangement was implemented, nor about the precise date at which it began to function. At any rate, it was still in operation in 1231, as attested by the agreement reached between Venice and the future emperor John of Brienne. It was obviously mentioned then because Venice sought reassurances that it would be maintained, which must indeed have been the case. The agreement of 1231 specified that the peasants of certain villages, known from other sources as *casalia monetae*, were to fulfill their obligation toward each of the two parties by paying the *moneta caragii* customary in the Byzantine period. Such villages also appear in Latin Romania since 1206 in another context, namely the relations between the feudal lords and the Church. They were submitted to a particular taxation system, the exact nature of which remains unclear. There is no Byzantine evidence about specific villages in which it was in existence prior to 1204. However, the *moneta caragii* mentioned in 1231 recalls the Byzantine χαράγή or χάραγμα. It may be conjectured, therefore, that the peasants of these villages were required to deliver jointly their taxes in gold coins, and in order to ensure such payments large groups of tax-payers were maintained. This arrangement prevented the partition of the estates on which they were settled, in contrast to other estates that had been enfeoffed to several holders. From the testimony of 1231 we may gather that the payment assigned to Venice was delivered by specific peasants³⁶. Incidentally, Venice was accustomed to sharing the income of undivided villages in another area of the eastern Mediterranean: in the countryside of Tyre it collected one third of the income of several such villages since 1124 or 1125³⁷.

The treaty of March 1204, which determined the principle to be applied in the division of the Latin Empire, was negotiated by Doge Enrico Dandolo on behalf of Venice. The doge was present in Constanti-

³⁶ The treaty of 1231 stipulated *ut rustici de casalibus qui debent servire monetam caragii (. . .) faciant omnia servitia monete caragii sicut soliti erant facere tempore Grecorum et nunc faciunt*: *TTH* II 283–284 and 292. On the Byzantine terms in the twelfth century, see N. G. SVORONOS, *Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: le cadastre de Thèbes*. *BCH* 83 (1959) 110–116. The connection with the Church appears in 1206, 1219 and 1222: see *TTH* II 32; R. L. WOLFF, *Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261*. *DOP* 8 (1954) 256–257, 267–271 and 300, repr. in *idem*, *Studies*, no. IX. The text of 1222 refers to the *casalia monetae* that could not be divided.

³⁷ See above, n. 14.

nople when the *Partitio* was compiled in the autumn of 1204. He was thus the recipient of the Venetian portion on behalf of the Commune, as implied by the text of the *Partitio*, in which the property allocated to Venice was introduced by the heading *Pars domini ducis et comunis Venetiae*³⁸. We have noted that Venice got hold of real property in Constantinople and specific localities of Thrace in the second half of 1204. Unfortunately, we have no clues as to which specific sections of this property, held under its exclusive authority, were considered feudal and which not, although it is likely that all assets acquired by the Commune before the Fourth Crusade belonged to this last category. Evidently, Venice could freely administer and dispose of non-feudal state property and rights. Some time before July 1206 the Venetian podestà in Romania, Marino Zeno, granted such property in Halmyros and in other places to the monastery of San Giorgio Maggiore in Venice³⁹. In February 1208 this same institution was allowed to engage in fishing along a section of the shore of the Golden Horn that had been added to the pre-1204 Venetian quarter in Constantinople. In February 1207 Zeno transferred to the patriarch of Grado, Benedetto Falier, land, houses and wharves of the Commune in Constantinople within an area apparently identical with the Venetian quarter existing before 1204⁴⁰. The condition of feudal land held by Venice was more complex, because it was inserted within the overall network of feudal tenures and services headed by the emperor. As all fiefholders in the Empire were liable to military service to the emperor, it is important to clarify how and by whom the fiefs belonging to Venice's

³⁸ This heading must have appeared, therefore, in the original version of the text and is not a late interpolation, as suggested by BORSARI, *Studi* 18, who relied on the dating of the *Liber Pactorum* I to the late thirteenth century without being aware that this manuscript had been redated to the first decades of that century: see below, n. 103.

³⁹ *TTH* II 15–17. San Giorgio already held property in Halmyros prior to 1204: see LILIE, *Handel* 189.

⁴⁰ *TTH* II 47–49 and 4–8, respectively; these documents are dated February 1207 and February 1206 according to Venetian style, and thus were in fact drafted in 1208 and in 1207, respectively, as confirmed by the indiction cycle they mention. Doge Ranieri Zeno refers to all these documents in 1256: *ibid.* III 23–24. Note in the second charter the references to the tower of the Blachernae palace and to the new wall built by Marino Zeno. On the Venetian quarter, see H. F. BROWN, *The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the close of the Twelfth Century*. *JHS* 40 (1920) 74–80; R. JANIN, *Constantinople byzantine*. Deuxième édition. Paris 1964, 247–249, 291–292; *idem*, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*. Première partie: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, tome III: *Les églises et les monastères*. Paris 1969, 571–573. On property within the pre-1204 quarter, see BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* 31–39. Neither of these studies locates in a satisfactory way the boundaries of the pre-1204 Venetian quarter or those of the enlarged one existing between 1204 and 1261.

portion were actually distributed, the precise status of these tenures and their holders and, finally, the group identity of the latter.

We have seen that the treaty of March 1204 called for the creation of a mixed commission, composed of an equal number of Venetians and "French" crusaders, which would distribute fiefs and assign to each of them the service owed in return. The treaty also stipulated that all those holding fiefs in the Empire would offer military service at the request of the emperor and swear to fulfill this obligation; the Venetians were obviously included, although not explicitly mentioned. At first glance it would thus seem that the mixed commission also allotted the fiefs belonging to Venice's portion and that an imperial body issued the appropriate documents to the recipients⁴¹. Such a procedure would have implied that Venice itself had no particular standing with respect to the Venetian fiefs or their holders. However, two statements issued by the podestà Marino Zeno dispel this impression. The first one, made public shortly after Zeno's election on 29 June 1205, speaks of "the people of Venice and the other people to whom *we* gave [tenures] from our assets in fief and whom *we* received in the service of the doge of Venice"⁴². The second statement, dated October of the same year, refers to "the time at which *we* divided" Venice's portion of the Empire "among ourselves, Venetians and other men who had entered into the fealty and service of the lord doge of Venice"⁴³. It follows that Venice first received the territories to which it was entitled to, and that its own officers later apportioned the fiefs. The grant of the fief of Lampsakos in 1214, which will be examined in detail below, illustrates the implementation of this procedure.

A close look at the events occurring at Rodosto in April 1205 further confirms the strong link existing between the doge, the Venetian fiefs and their holders. When Rodosto was threatened by the Vlacho-Bulgarian forces of Tsar Ioannitsa, it was Doge Enrico Dandolo who ordered a

⁴¹ Text in *TTH* I 447–448, 451–452. CARILE, *Per la storia* 352–354, deals with the delivery of the documents. BORSARI, *Studi* 17–20, 91–92, does not explicitly state, yet implies that the Venetian fiefs were handed out by the joint commission.

⁴² *TTH* I 558–561 (misdated by the editors). The relevant passage is incomprehensible, unless slightly emended: *cum (. . .) conlaudatu [sic] populi Venetie et de aliis gentibus, quibus [instead of quod] dedimus de nostris bonis in feodo et quos [my addition] recepimus in servitio domini ducis*, and further, *de hiis quod datum habemus vel darentur, nullus homo audeat alienandum, nisi Venetico*.

⁴³ *TTH* I 569–571: *quod in divisione iam dicte nostre quarte partis et dimidie eiusdemque imperii Romanie, que nobis nostroque comuni habere contingebat, tempore quo dividebamus inter nos Venetos et alios homines qui venerant in fidelitate et servitio domini Venecie ducis*. We shall return below to the inclusion of the "other men" among the fiefholders of Venice, mentioned in both documents of 1205.

Venetian garrison to be stationed in the city, which as we have seen belonged to Venice's portion of the Empire⁴⁴. This garrison was most likely composed of individuals established in the region and holding Venetian fiefs, who could easily be assembled to defend the city. It follows that even after having been settled these fiefholders remained a separate contingent under the direct command of the doge. Furthermore, although each of them had individually assumed a military obligation toward the emperor in return for his fief, it was the doge who was responsible for the collective rendering of the service owed by the Venetian portion of the Empire. The same principle is expressed some time later in the previously mentioned statements of the podestà Marino Zeno, issued on 29 June and in October 1205: both of them mention that the Venetian fiefs in the Empire had been granted in return for their holder's service to the doge, without referring to the emperor. According to the podestà's conception, then, the beneficiaries of these fiefs were subject to the authority of Venice and owed it military service⁴⁵. The apparent contradiction with the treaties stipulating that they were liable to service to the emperor can be resolved if we assume that Marino Zeno, like Doge Enrico Dandolo before him, considered that as representative of Venice he was answerable for the entire amount of service to be rendered to the emperor by the fiefholders of the Venetian portion. In fact, this view conformed with a specific clause of the treaty of March 1204, according to which this responsibility rested with Doge Enrico Dandolo and after him with Venice's representatives⁴⁶. A similar arrangement was in force in the Kingdom of Jerusalem, where Venice was accountable to the kings for the collective discharge of military service owed by its share of the lordship of Tyre; in practice this service was performed by Venetian individuals who held fiefs granted by the Commune⁴⁷. One may wonder whether this case served as a precedent when the relationship between the emperor, Venice and its fiefholders in the Latin Empire was devised.

Our tentative conclusions with respect to this relationship are reinforced by other considerations. Marino Zeno's decree of 29 June 1205, mentioned above, stipulated that property belonging to the Venetian portion and granted in fief, whether in Constantinople or elsewhere in the Latin Empire, should be transferred to Venetians only; alienation in

⁴⁴ VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête*, II, paras. 386, 415–416.

⁴⁵ This is precisely illustrated in the early 1220's by the case of Gerard of Stroem, examined below, 163.

⁴⁶ See above, 145, and n. 12.

⁴⁷ See above, 145.

favour of foreigners was prohibited and illegal and would be punished by heavy fines. Zeno restated the same principles three months later, on 29 September, in a proclamation requested by the envoys sent by the vice-doge, Raniero Dandolo⁴⁸. The podestà and the vice-doge were obviously anxious to preserve Venice's portion of the Empire, yet they may also have been prompted to issue these statements because Venice had experienced in the last year or so the loss of one or several fiefs. Incidentally, such a loss had occurred in the past in the Kingdom of Jerusalem: around the mid-twelfth century a fief belonging to the Venetian portion of the lordship of Tyre had been transferred to the king of Jerusalem by the widow of a Venetian fiefholder, and in 1205 Venice still maintained its claim to this property⁴⁹. The treaty of October 1205, concluded between Henry of Hainaut and Marino Zeno, also had a bearing on Venice's hold on its portion of the Latin Empire. It confirmed the provision of March 1204 regarding active military service: all fiefholders were liable to it when summoned by the emperor, who would be advised on this matter by a mixed council representing both parties. The new treaty also determined the specific circumstances in which the service was to be rendered and the amount of it required in each emergency. Finally, disputes between the emperor and fiefholders about the implementation of their mutual obligations would not entail any confiscation of fiefs by the emperor and be settled by a mixed judicial commission appointed by the emperor's council⁵⁰.

The sources examined so far reveal the existence of a complex tripartite relationship involving the emperor, the Venetian state or its representatives, and the Venetian fiefholders. This pattern obviously favoured the interests of Venice, which insisted upon its role as intermediary between the other two parties. The decree of Marino Zeno of June and the judicial clause of October 1205, both mentioned above, preserved Venice's authority over its own fiefholders and territorial portion and prevented the latter's diminution, whether at the hands of individuals or the emperor. The exercise of the Commune's authority in this respect was displayed in 1206 by Zeno's cession of Adrianople to Theodore Branas, who assumed various military and financial obligations toward Venice and more specifically toward the doge, and thus recognized the Com-

⁴⁸ See above, n. 42, and *TTH* I 566–568 (misdated by the editors).

⁴⁹ Its claim was reiterated in 1242 by the Venetian bailo in the Levant, Marsilio Zorzi: see *PRAWER*, *Crusader Institutions* 147, 149. A fief in this region is mentioned in a charter of 1206: *TTH* II 11–13.

⁵⁰ See above, 147.

mune's authority over himself and the city⁵¹. As for the fiefholders within the Empire, all of them were liable to the same type of service, in proportion to their fiefs' revenue, yet whereas the "French" fiefholders were subject to the supreme authority of the emperor, such was not the case with those of the Venetian portion. Though individually responsible for their military service toward the emperor, these fiefholders, who had been granted property belonging to the Venetian state, remained a separate contingent under the command of the podestà, who exercised his authority on behalf of the Commune over their person as well as their fief. In turn, the podestà was accountable to the emperor for the collective delivery of the service to which the Venetian portion was liable. The explicit reference to the military obligation of the Venetians appearing in the treaty of October 1205 may have been a reassurance sought by Henry of Hainaut that the Commune's representative would not take advantage of his position as intermediary to curtail the Venetian service to which the emperor was entitled⁵².

The Venetian fiefholders in the Latin Empire

The perpetuation of the intricate tripartite relationship we have just reconstructed was fostered by the enfeoffment policy implemented by Venice within its portion of the Latin Empire. Two factors explain this policy. The absence of an adequate Venetian state apparatus prevented Venice from maintaining and directly exploiting a state domain in its rural territories of Latin Romania, similar to the imperial domain that had existed in them under Byzantine rule. In addition, Venice had to uphold a military contingent, which not only bolstered the Empire's defence, but also reinforced the Commune's political standing with respect to the emperor. Venice, therefore, transferred sections of its portion of the Empire to individuals who held them in fief and who, in return for the revenue they collected from their respective tenures, assumed both military and fiscal obligations toward the Commune and swore fealty to the doge⁵³.

⁵¹ See above, 151; the doge is mentioned twice.

⁵² BORSARI, Studi 17–20, has not perceived this tripartite relationship and erroneously claims that the Commune had no authority over the Venetian fiefholders in the years 1204–1205; this in turn leads him to far-reaching conclusions about the "autonomy" of the Venetian fiefholders in the Latin Empire with respect to the Commune and the latter's representatives.

⁵³ The absence of a state domain and the same enfeoffment policy were to be found in Corfu in 1207 and in Crete since 1211: see BORSARI, Studi 27–28, 95–96, and below, n. 55.

A letter sent by the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo to Doge Pietro Ziani in December 1219 faithfully reflects the Venetian enfeoffment policy. This letter records the changes introduced by the podestà in the government of Rodosto, which as noted above belonged to Venice's portion of the Empire. We find in it a reference to *sestieri*, from which we may gather that the Venetian fiefholders living permanently in the city were organized in groups according to the respective *sestiere* or quarter of Venice from which they originated⁵⁴. Such an organization is attested in Crete since 1211 and it may prove useful, therefore, to briefly examine its function in this island. When Venice began to settle Crete, it divided its territory into six sections, except for the island's capital, Candia, and a specific area around this city which the Commune retained. Each of these sections corresponded to one of the six *sestieri* of Venice and was awarded to the latter's military contingent, which was composed of two distinct groups: members of prominent Venetian families, who for the most part appear as *milites* or horsemen and later as *feudati* owing mounted military service, and *pedites* or foot soldiers mostly coming from lower ranks of Venetian society. These settlers were granted property in the countryside, part of which had still to be conquered, as well as a house in Candia. Those belonging to the first group received tenures called *militie*, *cavallerie* or *feuda*, which were much larger than the *serventarie* or sergeantries allotted to the others. The distribution of the tenures, which could be transferred exclusively to other Venetians, was carried out by the Venetian duke and his councillors governing the island. The beneficiaries had to be properly equipped, according to their military function, and provide military service when required. They were exempt from individual payments, yet after the initial four years the settlers of each *sestiere* in the island would collectively deliver a yearly sum of 500 hyperpers to the state treasury in Venice. Finally, each of the settlers was expected to take an oath of allegiance to the Commune⁵⁵. The whole arrangement was

⁵⁴ *TTH* II 218: *a militibus sextariorum*.

⁵⁵ *TTH* II 129–145, and for the oath, 131, 133–134; on later arrivals, see *ibid.* 234–249; also E. GERLAND, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Kandia*. Strassburg 1899, 76–81, and for the oath 77. In addition, see D. JACOBY, *Social Evolution in Latin Greece*, in: SETTON, *History of the Crusades*, VI 192–193, with reference to previous work on the subject. G. RÖSCH, *Der venezianische Adel bis zur Schließung des Großen Rats. Zur Genese einer Führungsschicht (Kieler Historische Studien 33)*. Sigmaringen 1989, 123, n. 66, points to the presence of members of old families among the sergeants. On the rules applying to military tenures in Crete, see E. SANTSCHI, *La notion de "feudum" en Crète vénitienne (XIIe–XIVe siècle)*. Montreux 1976, 52–167, and on the oath in particular, 65–69. This study should be used with extreme caution; in particular the conclusion, 185–212, according to which Venice introduced feudalism in Crete, may be safely rejected, as one of the basic

devised for military purposes, so as to enable the imposition and preservation of Venetian rule in Crete. Both the grouping of the settlers in military contingents and their settlement according to their *sestiere* of origin were imposed by the Venetian government, and not spontaneous. From later sources we learn that as a rule the Latin settlers of Crete lived in cities, where they felt more secure than in the countryside and from where they controlled their respective rural tenures⁵⁶.

The language, formulae and obligations, as well as the grant of land connected with the settlement process in Crete were largely borrowed from a feudal milieu and strongly reminiscent of those appearing in the twin ceremonies of vassalage and investiture performed in the feudalized areas of the West. One important component, however, was missing: there was no rite of homage, by which the future vassal placed himself in the dependence and under the protection of his future lord and created between them an everlasting personal bond⁵⁷. In other words, in Crete the fiefholder solemnly promised by an oath of fealty to fulfill his obligations toward the state and follow the instructions of the latter's representatives, yet Venice refrained from adopting the strictly personal relationship of subordination deriving from homage. This crucial difference between Venice's regime in Crete and that existing in the feudalized areas of the West clearly reflected the Commune's distinctive political and legal system, based on the notion of statehood and devoid of a hierarchic social structure sanctioned by custom or by law.

The Cretan case, which is fairly well documented, enables us to draw some important conclusions with respect to the pattern of Venetian enfeoffment and settlement in the early years of the Latin Empire. It is true that the organization of Venetian fiefholders in Rodosto according to *sestieri* is recorded in 1219. Nevertheless, there is good reason to believe that it perpetuated an institutional pattern imposed by the Venetian authorities, as in Crete, at the outset of the settlement process in the Empire, when Venice took hold of Rodosto in 1204. The military contingent on which Doge Enrico Dandolo relied in April 1205 for the defence of this city was most likely based on the *sestieri*⁵⁸. At the latest this arrangement must have been implemented when Venice reoccupied

characteristics of such a regime, namely the privatization of state prerogatives, was totally missing in the island. Note *cavalarie* below, n. 175.

⁵⁶ See JACOBY, *Social Evolution* 194–197.

⁵⁷ M. BLOCH, *Feudal Society*, trans. L. A. MANYON. Chicago 1970, I 145–147, insists on the distinction between homage and fealty, both in form and content, and on the existence of fealty without homage even in the feudalized areas of the West.

⁵⁸ See above, 155.

Rodosto in 1206. It should be stressed that when the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo reasserted his authority over the city in October 1219, he objected to the fact that the fiefholders had created an autonomous commune: they had usurped and exploited without proper state control property and sources of income belonging to Venice, which he recovered, and had elected to urban offices individuals, whom he replaced by others who were elected under his own supervision, were therefore more willing to comply with his orders, and swore fealty to the doge⁵⁹. On the other hand, there is not even the slightest hint that the podestà opposed the grouping of the fiefholders according to *sestieri* or that he abolished it. As in Crete, this grouping was motivated by military needs and linked to the distribution of fiefs. It follows that Venice alone had decided how and to whom these fiefs, carved out of its own portion of the Latin Empire, should be distributed. We may safely conjecture that the urban and rural territory of Rodosto had been divided into sections corresponding to the *sestieri* of Venice, and that this pattern had also been applied elsewhere in the Venetian portion of the Empire. Significantly, in 1207 and 1208 Leonardo Vendilino and Domenico Signolo did not refer to the Venetian parish, but to the *sestiere* of Cannaregio from which they originated, which seems to imply that they belonged to one of the contingents mentioned above. This did not prevent them from holding in Constantinople property owned by the patriarchate of Grado, as mentioned in two unpublished documents⁶⁰. It is noteworthy that the fiefholders of Rodosto lived in the city while enjoying tenures in the countryside. The same picture emerges from the enumeration of the property recovered by Venice in the Gallipoli peninsula, presumably in 1206. Each group of villages appears under the heading of a city in which Venice's fiefholders resided, while holding *cavallerie* or fiefs in these villages, as they had done in 1204–1205 before the arrival of Ioannitsa's troops in the area⁶¹.

These considerations seem to offer new insights into the origin of the grouping of the fiefholders according to *sestieri* and its use at the beginning of the Venetian settlement process both in the Latin Empire and in Crete. First, it may well be that the grouping applied in the Latin Empire merely reflected and preserved the basic organization of the Venetian contingents leaving Venice for the crusade in 1202, in the same

⁵⁹ *TTH* II 218–219.

⁶⁰ ASV, *Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 19–20; see also R. MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA – A. LOMBARDO (eds.), *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI–XIII* [hereafter: *DCV*], Torino 1940, II 42–43, no. 502.

⁶¹ For the text, see above, n. 16; for *cavallerie*, see below, n. 175.

way as in 1211 the grouping of the settlers bound for Crete had been established prior to their departure for the island. We may postulate that in the first case, as in the second, there was a division between *milites* and *pedites*, largely reflecting the social stratification existing in Venice. Furthermore, we may consider the successful implementation in the Latin Empire of the organizational device based on the *sestieri* as a precedent that was revived a few years later when the military colonization of Crete was contemplated. We know very little about the military organization existing in Venice proper before the second half of the thirteenth century⁶², yet the experience gathered in the two cases just mentioned may have prompted the Commune to use the *sestiere* as its basic unit. It is noteworthy that during the war fought by Venice against Bologna in 1270–1273 Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo mobilized contingents from the *sestieri* of Santa Croce and Dorsoduro and sent them into battle along the river Po⁶³.

Venetian citizens organized in contingents according to their respective *sestiere* seem thus to have constituted the core of the Venetian fighting force in the Fourth Crusade and in the first years of the Latin Empire. It appears, however, that these citizens were not available in sufficient numbers to go on the crusade, nor to take hold of all the fiefs Venice intended to distribute out of its portion of the Empire. The statements of the podestà Marino Zeno on 29 June and in October 1205 are eloquent in this respect: not only Venetians, but also “other men who had entered into the fealty and service of the lord doge of Venice” had received fiefs from the Commune⁶⁴. In other words, there were non-Venetians among Venice’s fiefholders, who in all likelihood were formally integrated into the *sestieri*’s contingents. This is hardly surprising, in view of Venice’s still limited demographic resources in the early thirteenth century. Its small population could not supply all the manpower needed for the manning of its huge fleet sailing to the east, nor for the creation of a well trained military force. Consequently, the Commune had to enlist foreign crew and men⁶⁵. A few years later a similar process occur-

⁶² See G. BELLONI – M. POZZA, *Sei testi veneti antichi*. Roma 1987, 77–80.

⁶³ MARTIN DA CANAL, *Les estoires de Venise*. *Cronaca veneziana in lingua francese dalle origini al 1275*, ed. A. LIMENTANI. Firenze 1972, 312, Parte seconda, paras. CXLI–CXLII.

⁶⁴ See above, 154.

⁶⁵ It follows that the size of Venice’s population cannot be extrapolated from figures referring to the Venetian contingent participating in the Fourth Crusade. The numbers for the “French” crusader host and the Venetian crew suggested by CARILE are certainly too large. For the host, see his *Per la storia* 80–92, 376–381, and *idem*, *Alle origini dell’impero*

ed in Crete, precisely for the same reasons. In 1211 the Venetian authorities planned the move of 540 families or some 2,500 inhabitants from Venice to the island, yet realized that the actual emigration would substantially fall short of their expectations and envisaged, therefore, the adjunction of Venetian as well as non-Venetian settlers. Indeed, later data reveal the presence in Crete of foreign settlers and military tenants from Istria, the Veneto, as well as more remote areas of north and central Italy, alongside Venetian *milites* and sergeants⁶⁶.

The foreigners who joined the Venetian contingent during the Fourth Crusade or in the Latin Empire undertook by oath to serve under the doge, and after April 1204 a number of them settled as fiefholders in the Venetian portion of the Empire. Both they and their fiefs were required to remain under the sole authority and protection of the Commune. They were later joined by other men of arms, who either had belonged to one of the feudal contingents or were newcomers in Romania. For instance, Gerard of Stroem, possibly a Flemish nobleman, held a Venetian fief in 1222–1223. In 1231 a clause of Venice's treaty with the future emperor John of Brienne refers to the Commune's fiefholders without specifying

latino d'Oriente. Analisi quantitativa dell'esercito crociato e ripartizione dei feudi. *Nuova rivista storica* 56 (1972) 288–314, briefly criticized by D. E. QUELLER, TH. K. COMPTON, D. A. CAMPBELL, The Fourth Crusade: the Neglected Majority. *Speculum* 49 (1974) 446, n. 24. CARILE, Per la storia 103–111, 375–376, estimates at some 17,000 men the crew of the Venetian fleet and with the help of other data collected from contemporary chroniclers arrives at a figure of some 70,000 inhabitants in Venice in the early thirteenth century, even higher than the one of 50,000 suggested by F. THIRIET, La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XIIe–XVe siècle). Paris 1959, 66, for which there is no sounder basis. In this context CARILE also mentions a census supposedly made in 1152, which recorded some 160,000 inhabitants; however, as I have shown elsewhere, this census has been misdated and was in fact carried out four centuries later, in 1552: see D. JACOBY, Les Juifs de Venise du XIVE au milieu du XVIe siècle, in: H.-G. BECK, M. MANOUSSACAS, A. PERTUSI (eds.), Venezia centro di mediazione tra Oriente e Occidente (secoli XV–XVI): aspetti e problemi. Atti del II Convegno internazionale di storia della civiltà veneziana (Venezia, 1973). Firenze 1977, I 163–164, repr. in JACOBY, Recherches, no. VIII. The size of Venice's population around 1200 is a vexed question that cannot be resolved for lack of reliable sources. It was most likely far below the 50,000 mark. The actual number of emigrants leaving Venice for Crete around 1211 also points to a lower figure than those suggested hitherto: see below.

⁶⁶ See above 158, and for the size and character of emigration to Crete, D. JACOBY, Les états latins en Romanie: phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204–1350 environ), in: XVe Congrès international d'études byzantines, Rapports et co-rapports, I/3, 22, repr. in idem, Recherches, no. I; BORSARI, Il dominio 29, 75–7, has collected evidence on foreigners in Crete, to which we may add a contract of 1224 by which three individuals from Oderzo undertook to remain for six years in Crete as sergeants with military obligations in the service of a Venetian: GERLAND, Das Archiv 115–116.

that these would necessarily be Venetians. They were to swear to uphold the agreement between the two parties, which entailed the discharge of their personal military obligation, evidently under the supervision of the Commune's authority⁶⁷. There is good reason to believe that these foreigners were inserted within the organizational structure of the *sestieri*, both for military and fiscal reasons, as in Crete in the course of the thirteenth century. In this way they shared the full burden of armed service and other obligations imposed on each of these units.

Foreigners who persisted in their function as fiefholders in Venice's portion of the Empire for a number of years may have become Venetian nationals, as suggested by the case of Gerard of Stroem, whom we just mentioned. He precisely relied on this function to request Venetian nationality from the podestà Marino Storlato in 1222–1223, and again in 1224 after the arrival in Constantinople of the latter's successor, Giacomo Tiepolo⁶⁸. Later sources confirm that Venice indeed naturalized foreigners in the Latin Empire. Its political standing in the early years of the Latin Empire was closely connected with its enfeoffment policy and strengthened by the presence of a large number of settlers, who held land in its own portion and performed military service under its supervision. Among these settlers we thus find Venetian citizens, naturalized foreigners, as well as foreigners who had submitted to the Commune's authority⁶⁹. The presence of foreigners, whether naturalized or not, was also conspicuous among the holders of real estate in the Venetian quarter of Constantinople since the first decade after the Latin conquest of 1204. We find

⁶⁷ On Gerard of Stroem, see next note. The text of 1231 reads *omnes qui ex parte Venetorum infeudabuntur de novo*: *TTH* II 286 and 295.

⁶⁸ According to a rubric of 1224 in the *Liber Plegiorum*, published by R. CESSI (ed.), *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*. Bologna 1931–1950 [hereafter: *DMC*], I 66, no. 69: *de Girardo de Streu, qui hominem esse cupit domini ducis ex terra quam habet, de quo capitulo interrogabitur dominum Marinum Storlato*, who had served as podestà in the previous two years: see below, 168. On Gerard, see WOLFF, *A New Document* (above, n. 17) 561, n. 3, who believes that the rubric expresses his wish "to be a vassal of the doge for the land he held". This interpretation may be safely rejected: the grantees' fealty to the doge preceded the actual transfer of the fiefs, and was not sworn afterwards at their request; in addition, I have already stressed above the absence of vassalage in the relationship between the doge and his fiefholders in the Latin Empire. Consequently, the issue here is not vassalage, but nationality. On Giacomo Tiepolo, see below.

⁶⁹ See D. JACOBY, *Les Vénitiens naturalisés dans l'Empire byzantin: un aspect de l'expansion de Venise en Roumanie du XIII^e au milieu du XV^e siècle*. *TM* 8 (1981) (Homage à M. Paul Lemerle) 218–221, repr. in idem, *Studies*, no. IX. Venetian naturalizations in Constantinople from 1261 to 1453, however, were prompted by political, economic and fiscal considerations: see *ibid.* 232–235.

among them, for instance, Armano Ferbitore, Enrico Allemanno, Megalotto Becani, Alessio and Teodoro da Durazzo, next to the Venetians Giovanni Barbadico or Barbarigo, Michele Venier, Giovanni Barastro, who originated in the parish of Santa Margherita in Venice, as well as Leonardo Vendilino and Domenico Signolo, both from the *sestiere* of Cannaregio⁷⁰. We have seen that these two were apparently fiefholders belonging to the contingent of their *sestiere*⁷¹.

The fief of Lampsakos and the Byzantine inheritance

Unfortunately, we have no direct evidence for the early years of the Latin Empire, similar to that bearing on Crete, about the procedure involved in the actual settlement of Venetians or foreigners by the Commune's officers, the identity of the fiefholders, their enfeoffment, the sources of revenue and yield of their fiefs, or the service to which these were liable. Somewhat later sources, however, provide precious information in this respect: they concern the city and countryside of Lampsakos, situated on the Asian shore of the Hellespont or straits of the Dardanelles. The fate of Lampsakos between 1204 and 1261, therefore, appears to be of major importance for our understanding of the Venetian position, policies and enfeoffment pattern in the Latin Empire.

After occupying the Gallipoli peninsula in November 1204 Henry of Hainaut crossed the Hellespont to Abydos in Anatolia, advanced toward Adramyttion and captured this city; he had received it in fief from his brother, Emperor Baldwin, in whose portion it was situated⁷². It may be safely assumed that in the course of this expedition his troops also captured the port and rural territory of Lampsakos. In March 1205, however, Henry abandoned all his conquests in western Anatolia and rushed back with his troops to Thrace to support his brother against the in-

⁷⁰ *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 11–12, 15 [= *TTH* II 52–54], 18–20. Note Ugolino di Parma, *habitor in confinio Sancti Bartholomei* in Venice, who received land in Constantinople in 1206: *DCV* II 21–22, no. 481. The use of *habitor* clearly indicates that he had formerly been a permanent resident in Venice, yet had remained a foreigner without the benefit of Venetian citizenship before emigrating to Romania; on *habitor*, see JACOBY, *Les Vénitiens naturalisés*, 219. The documents mentioned above have been summarized, yet without references to the individuals' origin, by CH. MALTÉZOU, *Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli (Scali marittimi)*, *Thesaurismata* 15 (1978) 47–51, nos. 19–21, 25, 29–31.

⁷¹ See above, 160.

⁷² VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête* II, paras. 310, 321–323; ROBERT DE CLARI, *La conquête de Constantinople*, ed. PH. LAUER. Paris 1956, 105, para. CXI; CARILE, *Partitio* 218, line 20 (text), and 243 (commentary).

vading Vlacho-Bulgarian forces⁷³. Some six years elapsed before a Latin army reappeared in western Anatolia. The decisive victory of Emperor Henry of Hainaut over Emperor Theodore I Laskaris of Nicaea on 15 October 1211 resulted in the renewal of Latin rule in this area, including the entire coastline stretching from Nikomedeia to Adramyttion. The treaty signed between the two states, presumably in the following year⁷⁴, sanctioned the Latin gains and ensured peace between them until 1224. In this year Lampsakos served as a base for the launching of a short Latin offensive in Anatolia, yet was afterwards occupied by the Nicaean forces of John III Vatatzes. The emperor constructed a small fleet at the neighbouring shipyard of Olkos, situated in a bay to the northeast of Lampsakos; somewhat later, however, he was compelled to burn it lest it should fall prey to the Latins. Later John III Vatatzes turned Lampsakos into an important naval base ensuring with Gallipoli the Nicaean lines of communications and logistical support from Anatolia to Thrace. By 1225 all Latin conquests in Anatolia except for Nikomedeia and a strip of land opposite Constantinople had been lost. In 1233 the Latin emperor John of Brienne landed at Olkos and managed to recapture Lampsakos, yet returned to Constantinople after a campaign lasting four months only. Lampsakos remained thereafter under Nicaea's rule⁷⁵.

Neither the *Partitio* nor other sources offer any information regarding the attribution of Lampsakos in 1204⁷⁶. In all likelihood Henry of Hainaut considered his conquests of October 1211 as part of the imperial estate. However, less than three years later, in April 1214, Lampsakos belonged to the Venetian state and remained in its hands in the following years, as attested by two Venetian documents: the first is an unpublished notarial charter of 4 November 1252, which records that the Commune granted Lampsakos to three Venetian citizens in April 1214; the second document consists of two closely related sections, an undated fiscal sur-

⁷³ VILLEHARDOUIN, *La conquête* II, paras. 340, 380.

⁷⁴ For this dating, more convincing than 1214, see F. DÖLGER, *Regesten der Kaiserurkunden des oströmischen Reiches*, 3. Teil, Zweite Auflage, bearbeitet von P. Wirth. München 1977, no. 1684.

⁷⁵ See LONGNON, *L'Empire latin 126–128*, 161–162, 172; H. AHRWEILER, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VIIe–XVe siècle*. Paris 1966, 315–320, 323–325, 329, 436–437. For the location of Olkos, see W. TOMASCHEK, *Zur historischen Topographie von Kleinasien im Mittelalter*, in: *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Classe* 124 L/8 (1891) 15.

⁷⁶ See the map in OIKONOMIDES, *La décomposition* 15.

vey of this estate and a statement formulated on behalf of the Venetian podestà at Constantinople, which lack any reference to the year of their drafting. The editors of this source have ascribed it to 1219 by relying on its location in three Venetian chancery registers⁷⁷. This dating may now be considered definitive, as the unpublished charter just mentioned reveals that the second document was issued sometime between 1214 and 1224, the year in which Lampsakos was lost by the Latins.

We have no information about the fate of Lampsakos between its second conquest by the Latins in the autumn of 1211 and April 1214, nor about its holder or holders in this period. It has been suggested that Venice received the estate in compensation for the losses it had suffered when the Vlacho-Bulgarian armies overran Thrace in 1205–1206⁷⁸. This assumption may be safely rejected. We have seen that Henry of Hainaut was compelled to abandon Anatolia in the spring of 1205, and when he returned there in 1211 Venice had for several years already recovered most of its assets in Thrace. Pending the discovery of new evidence, therefore, we remain in the dark about the circumstances in which Venice got hold of Lampsakos. On the other hand, it is easy to guess why Venice was eager to obtain this port, located on the Asian shore of the Hellespont opposite the Gallipoli peninsula. Most of the peninsula was in Venetian hands since 1206, and the holding of positions on both sides of the straits enabled a more efficient Venetian control of the vital waterway linking the Mediterranean to Constantinople. Significantly, in 1219 Emperor Theodore I Laskaris of Nicaea promised the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo that for the duration of his treaty with Venice, valid for five years, he would abstain from sending naval forces through the Hellespont to Constantinople, unless by agreement with Venice⁷⁹. The Venetians may have occasionally used Lampsakos as a naval base and taken advantage of the neighbouring shipyard at Olkos, which apparently was in operation when John III Vatatzes occupied it in 1224, as implied by the construction of a fleet there shortly afterwards⁸⁰. Venice's interest in the

⁷⁷ The charter of 1252 is ASV, *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8, no. 11. The other document was first published by *TTH* II 208–210, and is newly edited below, in Appendix A and B. Its second section bears an incomplete date mentioning September in the seventh indiction.

⁷⁸ See BORSARI, Studi 32.

⁷⁹ *TTH* II 207: *nec galee neque currentia ligna imperij mei debeant habere licentiam transire da [sic] Constantinopoli, nisi hoc fuerit de voluntate tue dominationis.*

⁸⁰ See above, 165.

rural area of Lampsakos, though, must have been rather limited, in view of the small revenue yielded by this portion of the estate⁸¹.

The unpublished notarial charter to which we have alluded was drafted in Venice on 4 November 1252 by the notary Bartolomeo, priest of Sant' Apostoli in this city, at the request of Giberto Querini, who hailed from the parish of San Polo⁸². As we shall soon discover, Giberto Querini was one of the holders of Lampsakos in 1214 and 1219. In 1252 he transferred his rights to landed property to his two sons, Niccolò who resided in Constantinople⁸³, and Pietro who lived in the parish of San Polo in Venice; the two brothers were to hold this property jointly⁸⁴. Some of it was situated "in the bishopric of Lampsakos (. . .) on [the shore of] the Dardanelles" (*in episcopatu Lapsaci (. . .) supra Avidum*), a wording most likely copied from Giberto's title to his portion of the estate⁸⁵. Lampsakos was then under the rule of Nicaea, as noted above, yet Giberto Querini apparently still hoped that it would be recovered by the Latins and, in any event, maintained his claim to his share of the estate. From his charter we learn that sometime before April 1214 Doge Pietro Ziani ordered the grant of Lampsakos to three Venetians: Giberto Querini himself, his brother Paolo, like him living in the parish of San Polo in Venice before his departure for Romania and, finally, Johannes or Giovanni Sucugullo, from the parish of San Stae in Venice. The three would jointly hold the estate as partners (*sotii*). In view of their social standing and their obligation to discharge a specific "service" to the Commune, the nature of which will soon be discussed, it is obvious that the grantees received Lampsakos in fief. This conclusion is confirmed by the stipulation that the estate was transferable to both male and female heirs, an inheritance clause mentioned in this context only because it applied to fiefs, according to the treaty of March 1204 between Venice and the leaders of the feudal armies⁸⁶. The three envoys of the doge, Giacomo da

⁸¹ On which see below.

⁸² See above, n. 77.

⁸³ His place of residence is stated in another unpublished charter, examined below.

⁸⁴ Many cases of brothers jointly holding property are recorded in Venice around that time: see e. g. *DCV* I 437–438, no. 446 (January 1200).

⁸⁵ The bishopric is mentioned in the *Provinciale Romanum* of c. 1210: R. L. WOLFF, *The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261. Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest. Traditio* 6 (1948) 48 (dating) and 52 (name), repr. in idem, *Studies*, no. VIII. On Avidum for Dardanelles, see CARILE, *Partitio* 239.

⁸⁶ *TTH* I 448, 451. Had Lampsakos been a non-feudal tenure, the inheritance to all heirs would have been self-evident and the reference to the clause superfluous.

Molin from the parish of San Stae, Ranieri Dolfin from San Cancian and Marino Storlato from San Tomà, must have left Venice for Constantinople with the maritime convoy sailing in the spring of 1214⁸⁷. Upon their arrival in the capital of the Latin Empire, presumably in April, they delivered the doge's injunction concerning Lampsakos to Marino Dandolo, who was then Venetian podestà at Constantinople⁸⁸. The three attended the ceremony, performed the same month, at which the podestà bestowed Lampsakos upon the grantees; the ceremony itself is not described.

As noted above, the document of 1219 regarding Lampsakos is divided into two sections. The first one enumerates the types of taxes, duties and revenues customarily collected and the labour services performed, whether in the city or in the countryside, and in each case provides an estimate of their amount, as well as an assessment of the total yield expected from the estate. This list, which has repeatedly been examined⁸⁹, is similar in content, disposition and terminology to fiscal inventories of specific estates known as *praktika*, in particular those compiled in Byzantium since the eleventh century and in the fourteenth century Frankish principality of Morea, the latter being clearly based on twelfth century Byzantine models. More precisely, the survey of Lampsakos recalls the final sections of these *praktika*, in which the peasant's obligations were summarized⁹⁰. The second section of our source is a statement

⁸⁷ The first among them had served as *iudex* in Constantinople in May 1206 and thus was acquainted with conditions in the Latin Empire: *DCV* II 19–20, no. 479. By February 1215 Marino Storlato was back in Venice: see FEES, *Reichtum und Macht* 369, doc. 254. In 1222–1223 he served as podestà at Constantinople; on this and other functions he held, see WOLFF, *A New Document* 561 and n. 2 and 3.

⁸⁸ This is the only chronological evidence we have for his term of office, which is mentioned without a date in an entry of 1224 in the *Liber Plegiorum*: CESSI, *DMC* I 9, no. 24; for the other functions he held, see WOLFF, *A New Document* 560, end of n. 3 of the preceding page.

⁸⁹ First by F. USPENSKIJ, *Sledi piscovich knig v Vizantij. III. Okladnoj list goroda Lampsaka. ZMNP* 231 (1884) 289–335; later studies by BORSARI, *Studi* 114–123; CARILE, *Per la storia* 243–247; G. LITAVRIN, *Provincial'nyj vizantijskij gorod na rubeze XII–XIII vv. (po materialam nalogovoi opisi Lampsaka). VV* 37 (1976) 17–29. Several other studies refer to the list in general terms or to specific items in it. All of them leave several fiscal terms unexplained.

⁹⁰ On these inventories, see JACOBY, *From Byzantium* 10–14. BORSARI, *Studi* 115, n. 30, objects to the comparison of the list with the *praktika* on the ground that it does not mention individual peasant holdings, which anyhow was not always the case, judging by some of the surviving *praktika*. BORSARI's objection is also related to the purpose of the survey, which was drafted in order to impose a fiscal burden on the holders of Lampsakos, rather than to grant them the benefit of the fiscal income from the estate, whether in part

formulated in September 1219 by a notary following the instructions of the Venetian podestà at Constantinople, whose name is not mentioned. This statement reflects the decisions reached by the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo and the majority of his council⁹¹. When considered jointly the two sections of our source reveal the sequence of events that led to their drafting.

In the autumn of 1218 the city and rural territory of Lampsakos were jointly held by three Venetians: G. Querini, J. Succugullo and J. son of P. Querini, only mentioned by the initials of their first names. The precise identity of the first, the second and the father of the third holder as well as their relationship is revealed by the unpublished charter of 1252. It should be noted that though still alive one of the three grantees of 1214, Paolo Querini, had been succeeded in his share of Lampsakos by his son Jacobus or Giacomo⁹². The three Venetians abstained from delivering in * cash the service they owed to the Commune. After several injunctions to this effect had failed to produce any result, the podestà in office at Constantinople, presumably Giacomo Tiepolo, decided to lodge a complaint against them with Doge Pietro Ziani, possibly in the autumn of 1218. Apparently in the spring of 1219 the doge ordered the podestà to carry out a fiscal survey of the estate of Lampsakos, in order to determine its total revenue. The podestà was later to make appropriate arrangements to ensure that the three Venetians fulfill their obligations toward the Commune: their yearly payments would henceforth be based on the estimate produced by the survey. In September 1219 at the latest the podestà sent to Lampsakos one of his officers, who conducted a field survey of the estate, in the course of which he assembled three types of data⁹³.

or entirely. This argument seems to me irrelevant: the fiscal character and disposition of the material, which follow Byzantine practice, definitely warrant the comparison. See also my arguments below.

⁹¹ See below, Appendix B: *Scripti ex precepto domini potestatis et maioris partis sui consilii*. Giacomo Tiepolo was in Constantinople in August 1219, and presumably even since the autumn 1218: see my dating below. On his first term of office as podestà, which lasted beyond June 1220 and probably beyond January 1221, see WOLFF, A New Document 560, and below, n. 179. On the function of the podestà and his council, see above, n. 17.

⁹² On these two individuals, see below.

⁹³ The dating of the various steps taken is important for the discussion of the survey, as we shall see below. The dates suggested here derive from several assumptions. As the statement of the podestà's chancery was drafted in September 1219, the survey must have been made at the latest in the same month; the doge's instructions were sent at least about a month and a half earlier, in view of the duration of voyages from Venice to Constantinople, and most likely arrived in April by the spring convoy linking these two cities. This suggests that the podestà forwarded his complaint to Venice by the previous convoy, in

First, he drew his basic information about the revenue of Lampsakos from a *praktikon* which he had brought along from Constantinople; the origin of this document, which he mentions twice, will be discussed below. Secondly, he collected oral evidence from the local inhabitants, determined their respective tax burden and divided them in fiscal categories, summarizing the revenues to be expected from each of the latter. Occasionally he questioned the peasants under oath about some of their obligations⁹⁴. He also reviewed other urban and rural sources of revenue, which will soon be identified. Finally, he used his own judgment to assess the revenue accruing from certain dues for which reliable evidence was lacking or about which he did not trust the testimony of the local population⁹⁵. The *praktikon* at his disposal apparently provided no information about the *angarie* or unspecified labour services, nor about the *angaria de castellis* or “castles labour service” (A, 34)⁹⁶. In sum, the surveyor’s goal was to update the information found in the *praktikon* on which he relied. The procedures and registration techniques he used conformed with Byzantine practice and were applied in contemporary and later fiscal inquiries carried out in other areas of Romania⁹⁷.

The surveyor sent by the podestà to Lampsakos either must have been a Greek, or else been assisted by a Greek individual familiar with the language and fiscal terminology used in the *praktikon* and capable of conversing with the local peasants in their own tongue. The extensive use of Byzantine terminology in the report is hardly surprising, yet there is evidence to suggest that the original draft of the latter was entirely in Greek, of which the version that has come down to us still retains some traces. Thus, for instance, the word *practico* reflects the Greek πρακτικό(v) (A, 10, 27), and so does the ending in -o of numerous fiscal terms; similarly, *vivaro* (A, 11) is clearly a phonetic transcription of the Greek βιβάριο(v), as pronounced in the early thirteenth century, distinct from the Latin *vivarium*⁹⁸. We may safely assume that in 1219, the year in which

the autumn of 1218. His identification with Giacomo Tiepolo is most likely, in view of the firm policy the latter implemented, on which see below. On the length of voyages according to later data, see THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne* 187–188. We have noted that the instructions for the grant of Lampsakos also arrived in Constantinople by a spring convoy, in 1214: see above, 168.

⁹⁴ As conveyed by *dixerunt per eorum sacramentum, manifestaverunt per eorum sacramentum* (Appendix A, 34).

⁹⁵ His assessments are introduced by *ponimus* [sic], *damus nunc*, *misimus finem*, the latter meaning “we imposed a due”, and *valent* (A, 8, 28, 29, 35, 37).

⁹⁶ The nature of these *angarie* is discussed below.

⁹⁷ See JACOBY, *From Byzantium* 10–14, and BORSARI, *Studi* 22, n. 18.

⁹⁸ See below, n. 198.

the report was compiled, few Venetian officers serving in the Latin Empire, if any, were capable of understanding a fiscal document drafted in Greek. A translation accessible to them and in particular to the state authorities in Venice, to which the report was to be forwarded, proved therefore indispensable. This translation was most likely carried out in Constantinople at the chancery of the podestà, yet we do not know whether its text or rather a copy of it was sent to Venice. It should be noted that the employment of Greek officers and the use of the Greek language in fiscal surveys, as well as the execution of translations for western use were common in other areas of Latin Romania as late as the second half of the fourteenth century⁹⁹.

Once in possession of the new survey the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo convened his council in order to determine the obligations of the three Venetians holding Lampsakos. According to the resolution adopted by the majority of the council members, the amount of service to which the three would jointly be liable in the future was to be based on the revenue of 1,670 hyperpers expected from the estate (Appendix B)¹⁰⁰. There was no need to specify the nature of this service, which was known to the parties concerned. It should be stressed, however, that only payments in cash were mentioned in this context, and the absence of any reference to military service requires an explanation, suggested below. With respect to the past, the holders of Lampsakos were to pay arrears amounting to 1,000 hyperpers in three installments, two until Easter 1220 and the third one somewhat later. The arrears were obviously also based on the revised assessment of the estate's revenue, and there is good reason to believe that they covered the five years that had elapsed since the grant of Lampsakos in April 1214. If so, they amounted to 200 hyperpers per year or approximately 12% of the expected yearly revenue of the fiefholders, each of them paying 66 hyperpers and being left with 490 out of a total of 556 hyperpers. This share of their revenue would have apparently covered the expenses incurred by effective military service and was considered as sufficient to replace it. The issue seems to have been solved once and for all in September 1219. This would account for the fact that Giberto Querini maintained as late as 1252 what he considered a valid claim to his share of Lampsakos and transferred it then to his sons, without referring to any legal or other problem. The report as well as the statement issued by the podestà's chancery – the latter drafted, as noted, in September 1219 – were soon sent to Venice and shortly afterwards

⁹⁹ See JACOBY, as above, n. 97.

¹⁰⁰ The council rounded off the sum by subtracting 1 hyperper and 6 keratia.

transcribed there in the *Liber Pactorum* I by a copyist working in the ducal chancery¹⁰¹. This copyist apparently encountered serious difficulties in his reading of the survey, illustrated by unresolved abbreviations, omissions, mistaken numbers, the erroneous reproduction of Byzantine technical terms, and the garbled version of certain passages, as the one dealing with vineyards, examined below. The text that has come down to us is couched in a defective Latin reflecting the Greek original survey, as well as the Italian dialect spoken by the copyist who, judging by the definite articles he used, may have been of Dalmatian origin¹⁰². It is noteworthy that the copyist did not encounter any difficulty in the reading of the podestà's statement, which was entirely drafted in Latin (Appendix B). The text of both the survey and the statement in the *Liber Pactorum* I served as models for later copies, one in the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century *Liber Pactorum* II and the other in the *Liber Albus*, presumably executed after 1345¹⁰³.

It is obvious that when Lampsakos was granted in April 1214, the podestà determined the nature and amount of the service burdening the estate, which depended on the latter's revenue. Why, then, was it at all necessary to carry out a new survey in 1219, only five years later? The arrears the three grantees of Lampsakos were ordered to pay after the execution of the survey in 1219 point to the answer. After holding Lampsakos for some time, the three apparently discovered to their dismay that the revenue it yielded was lower than expected and in their view insufficient to cover the service they owed to the Commune, while at the same

¹⁰¹ The podestà mentioned his sending of letters to Venice in September 1219 in another letter which he forwarded some three months later: *TTH* II 216.

¹⁰² The definite articles are *lu*, *li*, *la* and *le*. They provide an important clue for the reading of the report, as they clearly introduce Byzantine fiscal terms. The first article points to a notary hailing from central or southern Italy, Sicily, or the Dalmatian coast, which appears more likely considering Venice's links with this region: see G. FOLENA, *Introduzione al veneziano "de là da mar"*. *Bollettino dell' Atlante linguistico mediterraneo* 10-12 (1968-1970) 351, 370-371; B. MIGLIORINI - G. FOLENA, *Testi non toscani del Trecento*. Modena 1952, 18. (I wish to thank hereby ALFREDO STUSSI, Scuola Normale Superiore at Pisa, who kindly offered me his advice on Italian dialects.) The likelihood that the notary was Dalmatian is heightened by the misreading of a fiscal term on line 23: see below, n. 123. It is not excluded, however, that the "Dalmatian" element was introduced by a notary who copied the translated survey in Constantinople.

¹⁰³ L. LANFRANCHI (ed.), *Famiglia Zusto* (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, sez. IV, Archivi privati). Venezia, 1955, 66-67, has convincingly redated the *Liber Pactorum* I to the first twenty years or so of the thirteenth century on the basis of paleographic evidence; he has done the same for the second register. For the dating of the *Liber Albus*, see CARILE, *Partitio* 179-180. There are some insignificant differences between the extant versions: see my edition below, Appendix A.

time leaving them with a reasonable profit. This prompted them to withhold from the podestà the yearly service to which they had agreed. The most plausible explanation for the discrepancy between the expected and the actual revenue is that no survey of Lampsakos had been carried out in the years immediately preceding its grant in April 1214 and that the podestà relied then on an old *praktikon*, presumably the Greek document one of his successors supplied to the officer entrusted with the survey in 1219. We have no indication about the origin or dating of this *praktikon*. It may have been based upon a register found in a Byzantine provincial archive in western Anatolia in 1204, after the first conquest of the area by Henry of Hainaut, as no such register had been found in Constantinople by the commission in charge of the partition of the Empire in the autumn of 1204¹⁰⁴. On the other hand, it is possible that the fiscal register was compiled by the Nicaean administration after 1204 and found by officers of the Latin Empire following the second Latin conquest of western Anatolia in 1211. Whatever the case, the assumption that the *praktikon* used in the survey of 1219 was an extract of a Byzantine register is enhanced by two factors: the reference to the labour services performed by the peasants “at the time of their masters” (*in tempore de dominis suis*: A, 34), which points to the Byzantine period¹⁰⁵, and the existence of another Greek *praktikon*, presumably also copied for a Latin chancery in the thirteenth century, namely the one bearing on the region of Athens of which two folios only have survived¹⁰⁶. The copy of the *praktikon* stating the estimated revenue of Lampsakos must have been executed before Emperor Henry of Hainaut transferred the estate to the Venetian podestà, and at this occasion the two parties agreed about the service it owed to the emperor. The preceding considerations imply that already before 1204 the city and countryside of Lampsakos constituted a separate fiscal unit, which survived under the Latins. This would conform with the evidence provided by the *Partitio*: the distribution of fiefs in Latin Romania not only relied on the Byzantine fiscal pattern, but also perpetuated to some extent its territorial units¹⁰⁷.

The more the Greek *praktikon* used by the surveyor antedated the

¹⁰⁴ This would explain why the *Partitio* did not deal with the area of Lampsakos: see above, 149.

¹⁰⁵ These masters were obviously Greek, and not Latin lords holding Lampsakos between 1211 or 1212 and April 1214.

¹⁰⁶ E. GRANSTREM, I. MEDVEDEV ET D. PAPACHRYSSANTHOU (eds.), *Fragment d'un praktikon de la région d'Athènes (avant 1204)*. *REB* 34 (1976) 5–44, but for the dating after 1204, see JACOBY, *From Byzantium* 13, and 37, n. 37.

¹⁰⁷ See BORSARI, *Studi* 22, n. 18.

grant of Lampsakos in April 1214, the more likely it became that the fiscal revenue of the estate registered in this document would not match the actual yield obtained by the three Venetian grantees after that date. The turmoil caused by the events of 1204 and the ensuing warfare in western Anatolia, which lasted intermittently until Henry of Hainaut defeated Theodore I Laskaris in October 1211, caused considerable hardship to the population, disrupted its economic life, and generated peasant migration. The treaty signed by the two rulers determined for several years the new borders between the respective territories of the Latin Empire and the Empire of Nicaea and acted as a stabilizing factor, which apparently was not yet perceptible in Lampsakos in 1219. At that time the impact of the previous years was reflected on the estate in two ways, namely by the composition of the population and by the surveyor's explicit statements that some revenues had sharply declined. In 1219 the surveyor registered in Lampsakos and its countryside 113 fiscal units divided into four fiscal categories, which he enumerated in descending order according to the animal labour force owned by the peasants of each category: 21 *zeugarati*, 52 *voidati*, 18 *actimones* and 22 *apori* (A, 2-6). These terms phonetically reproduce those known from Byzantine sources dealing with *paroikoi* or dependent peasants, namely ζευγαράτοι, βοιδάτοι, ἀκτήμονες and ἄποροι. These were, respectively, peasants owning two oxen, one ox, or none, the latter literally "propertyless", and, finally, "poverty-stricken men". Before arriving at his summaries the surveyor had evidently recorded the heads of the fiscal units and the content of their respective *stasis*, which in most cases consisted of land, beasts of labour, other means of production and houses, yet this detailed listing has not survived. The average *telos* or tax delivered by the *staseis* in each of the categories reflected their relative economic standing: the *zeugaratoi* paid somewhat more than double the amount of the *boidatoi*, these in turn slightly less than the double of the *telos* of the *aktemones*, while the latter's tax was somewhat higher than twice the one delivered by the *apori*¹⁰⁸. The ratio between the first three categories corresponded more or less to the one reflected by a calculation made in 1104 by a tax-assessor who inspected the property of the Athonite monastery of Lavra: one *zeugaratos* = two *boidatoi* = four *aktemones*¹⁰⁹.

¹⁰⁸ On the peasant categories, the στάσις and the τέλος, see A. E. LAIOU-THOMADAKIS, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire. A Social and Demographic Study*. Princeton, N. J. 1977.

¹⁰⁹ The average *telos* paid by the four categories as expressed in keratia (a denomination equivalent to 1/24 of the hyperpyron) was 237.71, 115.84, 64.66 and 24.54, respectively; calculation by CARILE, *Per la storia* 245. The relevant passage in the Lavra document

In 1219 the surveyor of Lampsakos also found 60 *homines* who, in contrast to the former peasants, were newcomers on the estate and not yet registered as fiscal units. Such peasants were known elsewhere in Latin Romania as *exteri homines*, “foreign men”, or *agrafi*, “non-inscribed” villeins, and paid very low taxes as in Lampsakos¹¹⁰. The presence in Lampsakos of these *homines*, who are also attested in the Nicaean territories of Anatolia¹¹¹, is in itself not surprising in view of the flight of peasants seeking refuge and livelihood in relatively safe places. Significant, though, is their unusually high proportion, which may be roughly estimated at close to one fifth of the total population of the estate. We may postulate, therefore, a reduction in revenue between the pre-1204 period and 1219 due to the disappearance of formerly well established households and their partial replacement by newcomers, several of whom were presumably single. Moreover, these newcomers lacked a tenure, beasts of labour and other means of production. There were apparently also abandoned fiscal units in Lampsakos, which would imply an additional decrease in population¹¹².

From the language of the survey of 1219 we may gather that, until its compilation, neither the labour services nor the unspecified “gifts” recorded with them (A, 34–36) had been commuted into cash payments, as generally assumed. The surveyor used *valent* (A, 37) for the summary of these obligations, which points to an estimate of their value, instead of the verb *reddent* introducing the peasants’ regular payments in cash (A, 2); the two types of calculations are clearly different¹¹³. As the sur-

appears in P. LEMERLE, A. GUILLOU, N. SVORONOS, D. PAPACHRYSSANTOU (eds.), *Actes de Lavra*, I. Paris 1970, 293–294, no. 56, lines 48–51.

¹¹⁰ For the *homines*, whose status in this document has hitherto been misunderstood, see D. JACOBY, Une classe fiscale à Byzance et en Romanie latine: les inconnus du fisc, éleuthères ou étrangers, in: *Actes du XIVe Congrès international des études byzantines (Bucarest 1971)*, II. Bucarest 1975, 139–152, repr. in idem, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies*. London 1979, no. III.

¹¹¹ Though not under that name: see M. ANGOLD, *A Byzantine Government in Exile. Government and Society under the Laskarids of Nicaea (1204–1261)*. Oxford 1975, 104.

¹¹² Any population estimate is necessarily conjectural. If representing nuclear households, the 113 fiscal units would have accounted for some 450 inhabitants; the 60 *homines*, several of whom single, possibly represented about 100 newcomers, or around 18% of the total population. The items in A, 27–29, appear to refer to abandoned fiscal units: see below, n. 133.

¹¹³ On the “gifts”, see below. The claim that labour services at Lampsakos were commuted in the Byzantine period has most recently been repeated by A. HARVEY, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200*. Cambridge 1989, 110. On commutation in Byzantium prior to the Fourth crusade, see *ibid.* 108–113. In fourteenth century Frankish Morea we find both effective labour service and commutation, the choice between the two

veyor hints to the Byzantine lords of the peasants with respect to labour services, it is not excluded that before the survey of 1219 the fiefholders of Lampsakos did not take advantage of the latter, because they apparently were absentee landlords¹¹⁴. Yet after the survey, which included labour services in the general assessment of the estate's revenue, they may have adopted commutation, which was particularly advantageous because it saved both administrative costs and the need to use coercion to ensure the strict performance of these services. Labour services were directly related to the animal labour force available in each fiscal unit and, consequently, the load was heavier on *zeugaratoi* and *boidatoi*, who owned oxen, than on other peasants.

We have noted that the survey of 1219 distinguished between an unspecified *angaria* and *angaria de castellis* (A, 34). Originally, the Byzantine ἀγγαρεία constituted a public labour service owed to the state, which occasionally transferred it to landlords and was then used for the cultivation of their domain land. According to the Byzantine *praktika* the load was calculated per month and thus amounted to twelve or a multiple of twelve days per year or, exceptionally, to a day per week¹¹⁵. The *zeugaratoi* and *boidatoi* of Lampsakos claimed that each year they owed only twelve days of *angaria* (A, 34)¹¹⁶. The survey of 1219 does not separately record the number of days owed by the peasants on account of the *angaria de castellis*, the Byzantine καστροκτησία exacted by the state from the peasants of Lampsakos prior to 1204. In Byzantium this public service involved participation in the building and maintenance of fortresses and fortifications, yet was sometimes commuted into a cash payment¹¹⁷. Surprisingly, however, after combining the two types of *angareia* the sur-

apparently depending, as in Byzantium, on the specific conditions existing on the estate: see J. LONGNON – P. TOPPING, Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIVe siècle. Paris – La Haye 1969, 271–272, s. v. *servicium personale*.

¹¹⁴ See below, 178–179, 190–191.

¹¹⁵ See A. STAURIDOU-ZAPHRAGA, Ἡ ἀγγαρεία στό Βυζάντιο. *Byzantina* 11 (1982) 23–54. The public nature of the Byzantine ἀγγαρεία, at the rate of twelve days a year, was preserved under Venetian rule in southern Messenia in the district of Coron; curiously, in the neighbouring district of Modon the state *paroikoi* owed 13 days a year: see D. JACOBY, Un aspect de la fiscalité vénitienne dans le Péloponnèse aux XIVe et XVe siècles: le “zovaticum”. *TM* 1 (1965) 408, repr. in idem, Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine. London 1975, no. IV.

¹¹⁶ I have corrected the number “VII”, obviously a misreading for “XII” due to a scribe in Constantinople or the copyist of *Liber Pactorum* I, who was followed by those of the *Liber Pactorum* II and the *Liber Albus*.

¹¹⁷ See S. TROJANOS, Καστροκτησία. Einige Bemerkungen über die finanziellen Grundlagen des Festungsbaues im byzantinischen Reich. *Byzantina* 1 (1969) 39–57.

veyor imposed the same burden on *zeugaratoi* and *boidatoi*, namely forty-eight days per year or four days per month, and estimated it as having the same value, despite the fact that according to Byzantine practice the work performed by the *zeugaratoi* should have been worth twice as much as that of the *boidatoi*. On the other hand, the 2:1 ratio between the number of days imposed on *boidatoi* and *aktemones*, respectively, conformed with Byzantine custom, and so did the fourfold value of the work performed by the *zeugaratoi* in comparison with that of the *aktemones*. Indeed, in the Lampsakos survey each day of work offered by the former was estimated at 4 hyperpers, while the latter's day was valued at one hyperper only. In all cases, though, the estimate also included the equivalent in cash of the "gifts" delivered in kind, which will soon be examined. The ratio between *zeugaratoi* and *aktemones* corresponded to those expressed by the Lavra document we have mentioned¹¹⁸. It should be noted that the *homines* of Lampsakos were exempt of labour services, because they lacked the necessary means to perform them. The surveyor's estimates of labour services prove that he was familiar with the Byzantine fiscal system, yet it should be stressed that he also introduced a significant change which reflected the process of feudalization generated by the Latin conquest. All public taxes and services were privatized and assimilated to the payments and labour services previously discharged by the peasants to their landlord, in conformity with the feudal practice imported by the western barons into the Latin Empire. Venice followed suit in this respect in its own portion of the Empire, while in the territories of Romania under its direct rule it adopted a different policy: the public nature of Byzantine taxation and *angareia* as exclusive prerogatives of the state were upheld, even when temporarily or permanently ceded to an individual or an ecclesiastical institution¹¹⁹.

The survey of 1219 mentions sources of income other than those directly deriving from the peasants' labour force. These sources may be divided into three categories, similar to those found in the same year at Rodosto, another Venetian city in Romania, where they were labeled *schale*, *commerclia* and *redditus*, i. e. wharf taxes, customs and sales duties, and other income from diverse origin, respectively¹²⁰. It should be

¹¹⁸ See above, 175.

¹¹⁹ See JACOBY, *From Byzantium* 15, 19, 21–22; idem, *Un aspect de la fiscalité vénitienne* 417–420.

¹²⁰ In a letter of the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo to Doge Pietro Ziani: *TTH* II 218. I adhere here to this division in order to emphasize both the parallelism and differences between Lampsakos and Rodosto, on which see below. In the survey of 1219 the division of the revenues into groups is very odd, to say the least, and apart from those related to

stressed that some of these sources of revenue, like the labour services just mentioned, had belonged to the state in the Byzantine period, yet were privatized under Latin rule. Such was the case with the first two categories of taxes. The *scala* (A, 25) corresponded to the Byzantine σκάλλα or σκαλιατικόν, a tax paid for the mooring of ships along the wharf, the unloading of their cargo and the use of the neighbouring warehouses in the city's harbour¹²¹. The commercial duties at the *forum* or general market and those accruing from meat delivery, presumably by the butchers (A, 26), fall under the heading κομμέρκια¹²². The total receipts deriving from these three taxes amounted to 160 hyperpers only, somewhat less than one tenth of the total revenue from the estate, estimated by the surveyor at 1,671 and 1/4 hyperpers, or a larger share if we disregard the assessment of the labour services owed by the peasants. The three taxes constituted the most substantial item in the list of revenues produced by Lampsakos, except for the taxes paid by the peasants' *staseis*. However, considering Lampsakos' location on the Hellespont, the income from its harbour and market was rather small and implies that in the second decade of the thirteenth century commercial activity there had declined: it was basically serving the needs of the area's population and not geared to large-scale maritime commerce. The third category of revenue, called *redditus* in Rodosto, was gathered from various sources, some formerly public and others private. The holders of Lampsakos benefited from the proceeds deriving from judicial payments and fines (*le forfacte et iura et iustitie*: A, 20), yet as they apparently were absent from Lampsakos and did not exercise justice there the local inhabitants were required to pay collectively a fixed yearly amount in cash. The same holds true of deliveries in kind of lamb, poultry¹²³, fish, meat and grain (A, 21–23, 26, 31), the last three originally intended for the supply of the

fishing (see below, nn. 128–130) defies any logical classification according to legal or economic criteria.

¹²¹ See H. ANTONIADIS-BIBICOU, *Recherches sur les douanes à Byzance*. Paris 1963, 134–135.

¹²² On the various types of Byzantine *kommerkia* attested in Latin Romania and inherited from Byzantium, one of which on the butchers, see JACOBY, *From Byzantium* 14–15.

¹²³ The reference to *galline* precedes the definite article *lu* introducing a Byzantine fiscal term, which has been misread as *carlassare* by a copyist (A, 23) in Constantinople or, more likely, in Venice, who associated it with a locality called Carlasar in Dalmatia. Micha de Carlasar appears in the treaty of 1247 between Venice and Zadra as an inhabitant of the latter city: *TTH* II 443. In our survey, however, *carlassare* is definitely not a name, as suggested by LITAVRIN, *Provincial'nyj vizantijskij gorod* 19, 22.

Byzantine army¹²⁴. The landlords also received the “gifts” previously mentioned, which must have been identical with, or similar to the *κάνισκια* often mentioned in Byzantine *praktika*: these consisted of compulsory deliveries in kind, sometimes commuted into cash payments, originally offered by the peasants to tax collectors, yet more often found as ‘gifts’ presented three times a year to their landlords¹²⁵.

In addition, we find dues for the right to exploit various installations and localities: mills (*molenae*: A, 8), for which the *μυλόπακτον* was paid¹²⁶; salt pans (*saline*: A, 9)¹²⁷; a sea-water fishery (*vivaro*: A, 11) at Olkos, obviously close to the shipyard located in the vicinity of Lampsakos, which required the discharge of the *βιβάρπακτον* if the fishery was rented, or the *ἀλεία* in return for the right to fish¹²⁸; the *piscaria* “of Jerusalem” (A, 14), possibly a fresh-water fishery, for which similar payments were owed¹²⁹; a tax (*grippovoli*: A, 12) connected with the use of small boats of a type known as *gripo*, engaged in fishing¹³⁰; others related to

¹²⁴ In two instances we find *psuni* (A, 22 and 26: *lu psuni de lu pisce* and *psuni de carnibus*), which in middle Greek appears as *ψώνι*: see N. P. ANDRIOTES, *Ἑτυμολογικὸ λεξικὸ τῆς κοινῆς νεοελληνικῆς*, Thessalonike 1967, s. v. It is derived from the Byzantine *ὀψώνιον*; on this tax, see *ODB*, s. v. “Opsonion”. The *dimodeo* (A, 31) is the Byzantine *διμόδιον* or *διμοδαῖον*, which according to F. DÖLGER, *Aus den Schatzkammern des Heiligen Berges*. München 1948, 109, commentary to no. 37, line 52, was identical to the *σιταρχία*, on which see *ibid.* 338.

¹²⁵ For the meaning of *cum salute villanorum* (A, 35), see Ch. DU FRESNE DU CANGE, *Glossarium mediae et infimae latinitatis*. 1883–1887, s. v. “Salus”, para. 4, *salutes*, supplementary gifts or *xenia*. On the *κάνισκιον*, see HARVEY, *Economic Expansion* 105–106, 109; G. OSTROGORSKIJ, *Pour l’histoire de la féodalité byzantine*. Bruxelles 1954, 359–360; LAIOU-THOMADAKIS, *Peasant Society* 181–182. In the *praktika* the *kaniskia* were generally mentioned immediately after the *angareia*, as in the survey of Lampsakos. We also find the *exenium* in Frankish Morea: see LONGNON – TOPPING, *Documents* 269.

¹²⁶ See DÖLGER, *Aus den Schatzkammern* 191.

¹²⁷ See *ODB*, s. v. “Salt”, and, for the survival of Byzantine practice in Frankish Morea, LONGNON – TOPPING, *Documents* 322, *Index rerum*, s. v. “Sal”, “Salina”.

¹²⁸ See DÖLGER, *Aus den Schatzkammern* 191, and *ODB*, s. v. “Fishing” and “Vivarium”. Olkos in this context has been identified by USPENSKIJ, *Sledi piscovich knig* 329.

¹²⁹ “Piscaria”, the western equivalent of *βιβάριον*, was also used in Frankish Morea: see LONGNON – TOPPING, *Documents* 321, *Index rerum*, s. v. “Pescheria”. The agreement of March 1206 between Henry of Hainaut and the Church mentions *piscaria in mari et in aqua dulci*, salt and fresh-water fisheries: *TTH* II 32.

¹³⁰ For *gripo*, see H. and R. KAHANE, *Abendland und Byzanz: Sprache*, in: P. WIRTH (ed.), *Reallexikon der Byzantinistik*. Amsterdam 1969–, I, col. 414, no. 164, s. v. *γρίπος*; *MM*, IV 54, no. XIII: *χειρόγρυπον*, a fishing bark, in the early thirteenth century; *TTH* III 214: *de (. . .) uno grippo et suis retibus*. The term *nasgidio* (A, 12) remains unidentified. As A, 11, 12 and 14, refer to fish and fishing, *lu vathi* (A, 13) may also be connected to these subjects.

landings used for ships sailing downstream (*catavolo*) and upstream (*anavolo*: A, 32)¹³¹. The peasants also paid various sums for the lease of domain land not included in their *staseis* or fiscal units, which they cultivated under special terms. Such was the case with waste or barren land called *chersochorio* (A, 10)¹³². Other pieces, possibly including the land of abandoned *staseis*, were cultivated by sharecroppers, as implied by the twice mentioned combination of labour and *morti*, the fee for the lease or a tithe; some of these peasants were *boidatoi* (A, 27–29)¹³³. Furthermore, 360 *modioi* of vineyards were held under ἀνάκαμψις (A, 16–19), a long-term *emphyteusis* contract which provided for a division of the produce in equal parts between landlords and cultivators¹³⁴. Finally, the holders of

¹³¹ On *catavolo* or κατάβολος, which also appears as a place-name, see E. SCHILBACH (ed.), *Byzantinische metrologische Quellen* (Byzantine Texts and Studies, 19). Thessalonike 1982, 159–160; in our survey it must be a noun, as it is preceded by a definite article. See also USPENSKIJ, *Sledi piscovich knig* 334.

¹³² This composite word recalls, for instance, χερσοτόπιον, as in a document dated 1110: LEMERLE et al., *Actes de Lavra*, I 308, no. 59, line 26. The preceding *skillofacto* (A, 10) is also apparently a composite word, the second part of which may reflect the Byzantine πάκτον, as in ἀμπελόπακτον. *Skillofacto* cannot be identified, but must also have been a payment for the cultivation of domain land under the terms of a specific contract. Note σκίλλοκρόμμυον, wild onion, in Ch. DU FRESNE DU CANGE, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae graecitatis*. Lugduni 1688, s. v.

¹³³ Each of the two references is somewhat faulty, as the text should read *computatis suis laboribus in hac quantitate et morti*; see also below, 181. The term *disertis* refers to abandoned land; USPENSKIJ, *Sledi piscovich knig* 318, suggests that *plenis* is identical to *planum*, *terra arabilis*; *voidate* is obviously the transcription of βοιδάτοι. On μορτή, see P. LEMERLE, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century. The Sources and Problems*. Galway 1979, 38–39; H. F. SCHMID, *Byzantisches Zehntwesen*. *JÖBG* 6 (1957) 55–67, 96–99; LAIOU-THOMADAKIS, *Peasant Society* 216–221; ODB, s. v. “Morte”. In this context labour was not related to the peasant’s *stasis* and therefore not included in the compulsory service on domain land.

¹³⁴ The πλινθιον (A, 16, 18) was a Byzantine land measure equal to 3 *modioi* applied to vineyards: see SCHILBACH, *Byzantinische metrologische Quellen* 114, lines 1–23. On *anacapsi*, see D. A. ZAKYTHINOS, *Le despotat grec de Morée. II. Vie et institutions*, éd. revue et augmentée par Ch. Maltézoú. London 1975, 183–187; I. MEDVEDEV, *Une espèce mal étudiée du bail à long terme: ἀνάκαμψις*. *Byzantiaka* 10 (1990) 105–113. The paragraph referring to vineyards (A, 16–19) is marred by misreadings and the relation between the numbers mentioned in it is erroneous. Thus, for instance, the sum of 14 hyperpers on line 17 should have been smaller than the one on line 16, from which it was to be subtracted, as the text reads *de quibus habent*. We may thus conjecture that the first sum originally was “XXVIII” hyperpers, which would leave half of it to the landlords, as found in many contracts dealing with the cultivation of vineyards: see LEMERLE, *The Agrarian History* 38–39. The summary of 36 hyperpers and 3 keratia on A, 19, is obviously faulty, as it does not relate to the other data found on A, 16–18; in fact, it should have been 38 hyperpers and 12 keratia, if we take into account the summary on line 26, on which the total on line 29 and the grand total on line 34 are based. The errors have been made by a copyist

Lampsakos received payments for the exploitation of four localities, Macricampo, Damaskinea, Cranea and Carea (A, 32)¹³⁵. In three instances the surveyor of Lampsakos compared his estimates with the data registered in the Greek *praktikon* he had brought along. In the first one he stated that the revenue from the exploitation of two types of domain land, one of which was *chersochorio*, conformed with the estimate found in this document (*et tantum fuit positum per practico*), while in the other two instances, which deal with sharecroppers, his own estimate was half that of the *praktikon* (A, 10, 27–29)¹³⁶. The sharp decline in revenue from sharecroppers is yet another confirmation of the decrease in the working force, peasants as well as beasts of labour, in the years preceding 1219¹³⁷.

There was a striking contrast in 1219 between Lampsakos and Rodosto, which reflected the diverse functions fulfilled by small and medium-sized Byzantine cities under Latin occupation. We have seen that the total income produced by the city and countryside of Lampsakos was estimated at 1,671 and 1/4 hyperpers, a rather meagre sum shared by three grantees only. There is no information about the revenue of Rodosto in the same year, yet the grouping of its fiefholders according to *sestieri* implies that their number must have been considerably larger, and consequently also the revenue supporting them. The volume of trade and economic activity in the harbour and at the local market of Rodosto, fostered by the favourable location of this city, as well as the size and yield of its rural hinterland undoubtedly produced a total income by far exceeding that of Lampsakos. From the way in which the revenue of

working in Constantinople or, more likely, in Venice, and not by the surveyor himself, whose other numbers and calculations are correct.

¹³⁵ The absence of a definite article preceding these four words rules out the suggestion made by LITAVRIN, *Provincial'nyj vizantijskij gorod* 20, that these were payments in kind. Nor is his interpretation of Macricampo (Μακρύχαμπος) as referring to silk warranted. The ending in -o clearly points to a neutral or masculine word, such as χάμπος, and not to χάμπη or χάμπια, caterpillar in modern Greek; Macricampo is thus a place called "Long field" or "Long plain". However, the names of the other localities may hint at their principal produce, Damaskinea (Δαμασκινεία) and Cranea (Κρανεία) being related to the growing of plums and dogberries, respectively. Carea may be identical to Καρύα, nut tree, yet more likely to Καρέα, a place-name also appearing in the vicinity of Miletos: see TOMASCHKE, *Zur historischen Topographie* 37.

¹³⁶ The introduction of a full stop after *iuribus* (A, 26) reveals the parallel wording of the following two items on A 27–28 and 29, respectively. In the first case it is *que fuerunt date per practico* [followed by a sum], *damus nunc* [followed by a sum half the previous one], *videlicet pro medietate que fuit sibi data*; in the other case only the second half of this formula is quoted. Consequently, the lacuna on line 27 should be filled with a sum twice as large as the estimate of the surveyor on line 28.

¹³⁷ See above, 175.

Rodosto was presented in 1219 we may gather that the ranking of its components also differed from that found in Lampsakos: *schale* or port duties provided the main income, followed in descending order by *commercia* or market taxes and by *redditus* or other payments, including the peasants' contribution. It is noteworthy that in Lampsakos the peasants' payments constituted the largest item: those directly deriving from their fiscal units were estimated at about one third of the total revenue (34,78%), while combined with the value of the labour services and the unspecified "gifts" in kind delivered by the peasants they amounted to more than half (53,33%). On the other hand, the receipts from the harbour of Lampsakos did not even reach one tenth of the total. This city was thus definitely more rural in character than Rodosto and presumably served as residence to some of the peasants of the estate, if not to most of them¹³⁸.

The Latin Empire and the patterns of Venetian migration

The Fourth Crusade generated a demographic phenomenon, to which little attention has been devoted: it opened the way to Latin settlement, essentially urban in character, in the conquered lands of Byzantium in general, and the Latin Empire in particular¹³⁹. The first wave of settlers came from the ranks of the participants in the Fourth Crusade. Noblemen hailing from feudalized regions of the West were awarded fiefs in rural areas, as well as houses in Constantinople or in other cities. Commoners from feudal regions as well as residents of western commercial centers, such as Venice, also established themselves in cities, where they pursued various economic activities, some of them being awarded fiefs. We have already encountered the "French" and Venetian fiefholders of the Gallipoli peninsula¹⁴⁰. Our knowledge about settlers belonging to the nobility is mostly drawn from chronicles¹⁴¹. The data regarding the other settlers primarily derives from notarial documents, overwhelmingly of Venetian origin, many of which have remained unnoticed. They yield information about the fate of Venetian settlers and their descendants in

¹³⁸ On the revenues of Lampsakos and Rodosto and the important function of the latter's harbour, see above, 181–182.

¹³⁹ For the latter, see CARILE, *Per la storia* 110–113, 363–381, whose figures for Venice's population, however, are much too high: see above, n. 65. On the urban character of settlement in other regions of Latin Romania: see JACOBY, *Social Evolution* 194–196.

¹⁴⁰ See above, n. 16.

¹⁴¹ For example, see J. LONGNON, *Les compagnons de Villehardouin. Recherches sur les croisés de la quatrième croisade*. Genève 1978.

the Latin Empire, their links with Venice, their occupations and, finally, their urban and rural property. The whole subject calls for an extensive study, which will be presented elsewhere. Here we shall restrict ourselves to fiefholders in the Venetian portion of the Empire and focus on the grantees of Lampsakos.

The charter of 4 November 1252 dealing with Lampsakos, mentioned above at several occasions, reveals that two of the grantees of 1214, Paolo and Giberto Querini, were brothers. They belonged to a prominent Venetian family, whose standing markedly rose in the course of the thirteenth century, when several of its members became high-ranking state officers and church dignitaries¹⁴². More specifically, the brothers belonged to the branch of the Querini family residing in Venice in the parish of San Polo, located in the *sestiere* bearing the same name¹⁴³. From 1238 until his death on 28 August 1250 their brother Leonardo served as Patriarch of Grado, the highest office in the Venetian ecclesiastical hierarchy¹⁴⁴. We have no information regarding Paolo and Giberto in the period preceding the Latin conquest of Constantinople, nor do we know whether they had engaged then in trade with Romania. From the statement of September 1219, drafted in the podestà's name some five years after the grant of Lampsakos (Appendix B), we learn that one of the brothers, Paolo, though still alive, had been succeeded in his portion of the estate by his son, whose name is only mentioned by the initial J., yet may be safely identified as Johannes or Giovanni on the basis of a charter that will soon

¹⁴² See G. CRACCO, *Società e stato nel medioevo veneziano*. Firenze 1967, 85–86, 121–122, 126–127; BORSARI, *Il dominio*, 167, *Indice*, s. v. “Querini”, “Giovanni” and “Paolo”; RÖSCH, *Der venezianische Adel* 273–274, *Namenregister*, s. v. “Querini”, and next note. Unfortunately, the latter study does not provide comprehensive information about office-holders and emissaries sent abroad by the doges, which would have considerably enriched the evidence on the families of the Venetian élite. In our specific case, for instance, another Paolo Querini was temporarily in Constantinople in September 1205 as one of five envoys sent by the vice-doge Ranieri Dandolo: *TTH* I 567–568; he may be identical with the one who in 1205–1206, 1207–1208 and 1212–1213 served as *consiliator* or member of the Minor Consiglio of Doge Pietro Ziani in Venice: see RÖSCH, *Der venezianische Adel* 209. He or a namesake was duke of Crete in 1223–1224.

¹⁴³ Other Querini resided in the parish of San Matteo included in the same *sestiere* of San Polo and elsewhere in Venice: see CESSI, *DMC* I 269–362, *passim*; R. FULIN, *La Casa grande dei tre fratelli Quirini*. *Archivio veneto* 11 (1876) 147–156; R.-J. LOENERTZ, *Marino Dandolo, seigneur d'Andros, et son conflit avec l'évêque Jean, 1225–1238*, in: *idem*, *Byzantina et Franco-graeca*. Roma 1970, 412–413 and 415–419, for later members.

¹⁴⁴ See C. EUBEL, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*, 2. Auflage. Münster 1913–1914, I 265–266. The kinship is mentioned in two unpublished charters: *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 28 and 30.

be adduced¹⁴⁵. When Paolo Querini received his portion of Lampsakos in April 1214, he must have been at least forty years old. Indeed, some three years later, in January 1217, his son Giovanni was an adult legally entitled to act on behalf of his own father. Father and son met then in Candia, the capital of Venetian Crete¹⁴⁶. They were presumably engaged in a trading venture and intended to travel in opposite directions. Paolo appeared at that juncture as resident of San Polo in Venice, and it would seem that somewhat earlier he had returned from Romania to his native city in order to live there permanently. If he ever resided thereafter in Constantinople, it would have been temporarily and for business purposes only. Indeed, in Candia Paolo gave his son Giovanni full power of attorney to deal for an unlimited period of time with all his assets in Romania. Paolo was thus heading toward Venice. On the other hand, Giovanni appears to have resided permanently in Constantinople, where we find him some nine months later. The charter conferring him power of attorney contained a passage alluding to Lampsakos: Paolo mentioned in it all the property he held in Romania "jointly with other persons" and authorized his son Giovanni to take hold of his portion of these assets in his name¹⁴⁷. Paolo may thus have transferred his right to his own portion of Lampsakos to Giovanni in January 1217. In October of the same year Giovanni ordered a copy of the charter to be made in Constantinople and had it authenticated by Luca, the chancellor of the Venetian podestà¹⁴⁸, presumably in anticipation of the legal transfer of his father's assets, including the latter's right to the third of Lampsakos. We may thus conclude that this transfer occurred between October 1217 and September 1219. We have no additional information about Paolo, nor about his son Giovanni.

The evidence concerning Giberto Querini, brother of Paolo, and his sons Niccolò and Pietro is more abundant¹⁴⁹. In March 1209 Giberto served in this city as one of the *consiliatores*, the highest office under the podestà in the Venetian administration established in the Latin

¹⁴⁵ *TTH* II 209, who follow the *Liber Albus*, list the son as Ja., which is erroneous. Indirect evidence adduced below supports the reading of *Liber Pactorum* I.

* ¹⁴⁶ *DCV* II 109–109, no. 565. As the son must have been at least twenty years old, the father was born in 1177 at the latest. In the statement of 1219 Paolo's name is not preceded by *quondam*, used for deceased persons, which proves that he was still alive.

¹⁴⁷ The relevant passage reads: *omnes possessiones quas habeo in Romania, quas communes cum aliis personis habeo, et partem de ipsis pro me et ad meum nomen suscipiendi*.

¹⁴⁸ See above, n. 146.

¹⁴⁹ A namesake of Giberto was among the ten men to whom Doge Pietro Ziani transferred Corfu in 1207: *TTH* II 55–59.

Empire¹⁵⁰. He must have still been a resident of Constantinople when he received his share of Lampsakos in April 1214. Giberto is again attested in Constantinople several years after the loss of this estate to the Greeks of Nicaea in 1224. As noted above, this brother Leonardo Querini was elected Patriarch of Grado in 1238. In May of the following year Leonardo entrusted Giberto with the administration of the extensive property which his church owned in Constantinople; this property had been considerably enlarged by the podestà Marino Zeno in February 1207¹⁵¹. At several occasions between March 1240 and January 1242 Giberto dealt with plots of land, houses and wharves in this city in his capacity as legal representative of the Patriarch of Grado¹⁵². He may have continued to fulfill the same function until the death of Leonardo on 28 August 1250¹⁵³. This was obviously not his only activity and source of income between 1238 and 1250. By 1252 he had become prosperous and owned several houses in Constantinople, as we shall see below. Giberto's residence in this city did not prevent him from owning property in Venice in the parish of San Polo, from which he originated¹⁵⁴. We do not know whether Giberto already held these assets when he left his native city for Romania, prior to 1209, or whether he inherited them at a later date while living in Constantinople, which seems more likely. Whatever the

¹⁵⁰ F. CORNELIUS [CORNER] (ed.), *Ecclesiae venetae antiquis monumentis nunc etiam illustratae*, Venezia, 1749–1753, XIV, *Ecclesiae Torcellanae* 219, and see WOLFF, *A New Document* 573, for the function. Giberto's son Pietro cannot be identical with his namesake mentioned in 1205 and 1207 (*TTH* I 558, and II 4), because at that time he either had * not yet been born or was too young to hold an office.

¹⁵¹ On Leonardo, see above, 183. Zeno's grant is misdated in *TTH* II 4–8: see above, n. 40. The appointment of Giberto is mentioned in *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, no. 30. On the property of the patriarchate of Grado in Constantinople in the twelfth century and on the appointment in 1184 of a lay agent who also was a close relative of the patriarch, see BORSARI, *Venezia e Bisanzio* 43–45. The same occurred after the Latin conquest: in October 1206 Giovanni Bono served as agent of his uncle Patriarch Benedetto Falier; in March 1207 Patriarch Angelo Barozzi appointed his brother Pangrazio as his agent in Constantinople: *TTH* II, pp. 43–45, 52–54, 59–61; *DCV* II 42–43, no. 502. *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, no. 2, is an undated cadastre of the first half of the thirteenth century entitled *Scripture de Sancto Achindano de Constantinopoli pertinente al patriarchado de Venetia*, which according to cross-references found in notarial documents was established about 1240. The published text (*TTH* II 8–11) is marred by numerous misreadings. For many of the documents dealing with the patriarchate's property in Latin Constantinople, see MAL-
TÉZOU, *Il quartiere veneziano* 30–61.

¹⁵² *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 28–32.

¹⁵³ Another agent represented one of Leonardo's successors as Patriarch of Grado on 4 September 1253: *TTH* II 493, 494, 496.

¹⁵⁴ See the charter above, n. 77.

case, the owning of property in Venice undoubtedly stimulated him to maintain with his kinsmen in San Polo close relations, the multiple purposes of which will soon be explored. Sometime between 1242 and 1252 Giberto returned to Venice, where he retired to the monastery of San Felice on the island of Ammiana, situated in the Venetian lagoon; by then he was an old man and a widower¹⁵⁵.

Three unpublished charters from 1252 inform us about Giberto's assets in Constantinople and Venice. The first one, drafted in Constantinople on 28 March 1252, records a transaction between his two sons: Niccolò, who resided in Constantinople, bought for 60 hyperpers a large house and two pieces of land in this city from his brother Pietro, a resident of San Polo in Venice. This document was subscribed about a month later, on 24 April, by Luca, chancellor of the Venetian podestà, whom we have already encountered in 1217¹⁵⁶. In the second charter, dated 15 October 1252, Giberto offered his son Niccolò two plots of land and houses situated in the parish of San Polo in Venice¹⁵⁷. Some three weeks later, on 4 November, Giberto granted his portion of Lampsakos to both his sons; it was to be either held jointly or divided in equal shares¹⁵⁸. It seems likely, therefore, that the two brothers also received equal portions of the other assets their father owned in Romania and Venice. The three known transactions within this family in 1252 must thus have been preceded and followed by others, which can be partly reconstructed, although no direct testimony about them apparently survives.

It should be noted that although Niccolò lived in Constantinople, he received from his father assets in the Venetian parish of San Polo. We may safely assume that Pietro, who resided in Venice, similarly received property there. Pietro's residence in Venice accounts for his willingness to sell some of the assets he held in Constantinople to his brother. The large house

¹⁵⁵ When he held the office of *consiliator* in 1206 he must have been at least some 25 years old and thus born around 1190 at the latest; note the age of his brother above, n. 146. By 1252, therefore, he was sixty or more years old. Already by 1240 his signature was very shaky: *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, no. 30. In 1252 he divided his assets between his sons without referring to his wife, which implies that she was dead by then.

¹⁵⁶ *ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8, no. 19; for 1217, see above, 184. Luca also appears in December 1231, as well as in April, March and May 1240: *DCV* II 195–196, no. 658, and *ASV, Mensa Patriarcale*, b. 9, C, nos. 28–30. Niccolò Querini (the same or a namesake?) appears in the undated cadastre mentioned above, n. 151, among the holders of property close to the church of St. Akindynos, in the Venetian quarter existing before 1204; on this church, see JANIN, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, p. 571. The erroneous published version of the text in *TTH* II 10, reads “Nicolaus Christi”.

¹⁵⁷ *ASV, Cancelleria inferiore, Notai*, b. 65, no. 2.

¹⁵⁸ See above, n. 77, for the document. There is no hint to portions differing in size.

involved in this transaction was contiguous to two additional pieces of real estate which he held, one of which was owned by the Commune of Venice. There is good reason to believe that the property sold by Pietro Querini in Constantinople or, at least, part of it had previously belonged to his father Giberto, and that the latter had also granted some of his property in this city to his other son, Niccolò. It is impossible to ascertain whether Pietro left Constantinople in order to settle permanently in Venice shortly before March 1252, after receiving property from his father in this city as we have assumed, or established himself in Venice earlier. In any event, Pietro was temporarily in Constantinople when he concluded the agreement with his brother in March 1252, and in all likelihood took advantage of his journey to this city to engage in trading.

Significantly, both Giberto Querini and his son Pietro returned to Venice after living for many years in Constantinople, while Niccolò remained in this city. We have noted a similar pattern with respect to Paolo Querini and his son Giacomo. In August 1222 the widow of Giacomo Gradenigo, a fiefholder in Gallipoli, was living in Venice. It is impossible to ascertain whether she had always resided in this city or had returned there after the death of her husband in the previous year; at any rate, one of her daughters married to Giacomo Michiel lived in Venice¹⁵⁹. The dispersion of members of the same nuclear family, father and sons or brothers, and the return of some of them to Venice after a long period of residence overseas appears to have been fairly common within the Venetian social élite since the early thirteenth century. The retention of real estate in Venice, in particular in the parish from which they originated, fostered close relations of those residing overseas with kinsmen of the same family branch living in Venice. These relations were valued for two reasons: they enhanced economic activity and enabled the gathering of political and other support in Venice when necessary¹⁶⁰. In the specific case of the Querini brothers and their sons, this may have involved attempts at creating within the governing élite some kind of pressure group promoting their interests in Romania and supporting the existence of the Latin Empire.

Giovanni Succugullo from San Stae, a parish in the *sestiere* of Santa

¹⁵⁹ *TTH* II 249–250.

¹⁶⁰ See D. JACOBY, L'expansion occidentale dans le Levant: les Vénitiens à Acre dans la seconde moitié du treizième siècle. *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977) 239–245, repr. in idem, *Recherches*, no. VII; D. JACOBY, The Rise of a New Emporium in the Eastern Mediterranean: Famagusta in the Late Thirteenth Century. *Ἰδρυμα ἀρχιεπισκόπου Μακαρίου Γ'. Μελέται καὶ Ὑπομνήματα* 1 (1984) 168, repr. in idem, *Studies*, no. VIII.

Croce in Venice, was the partner of the two Querini brothers in Lampsakos in 1214 and retained his portion there in 1219. He belonged to an ancient Venetian family of more modest standing than the Querini¹⁶¹. A few members of his family are attested in the second half of the twelfth century, two of whom as residents of the parish of San Stae from which Giacomo originated. In 1164 Stefano was among the signatories of a concession of the Commune's revenues from the Rialto market to a group of individuals, in return for their loan to the state¹⁶². By 1171 he was dead, and so was his son Marco who had been involved in trade in Thebes¹⁶³. In June 1185 Leonardo Succugullo was one of the guarantors to the reimbursement of another loan to the Commune; thirteen years later he appeared among the witnesses to an undertaking made by a ship captain to Doge Enrico Dandolo¹⁶⁴. His son Giovanni resided in 1201 in England, where he held a large fief in the county of Norfolk¹⁶⁵. One may wonder whether Giovanni, the holder of a third of Lampsakos, remained in Romania or returned to Venice after the loss of the estate to the Greeks of Nicaea in 1224, and whether it was he or a namesake who was sent by Doge Giacomo Tiepolo on two missions, one in 1229 to the Sultan of Aleppo and the other in 1231–1232 to Crete. His long residence in the eastern Mediterranean and the experience he had gathered in this region may have prompted the doge to entrust him with these assignments¹⁶⁶. In 1252 Pantaleone Sucugullo held in Constantinople property adjacent to the house transferred by Pietro Querini to his brother Niccolò¹⁶⁷. Unfortunately, we do not know in what way Giovanni Succugullo, one of the

¹⁶¹ See RÖSCH, *Der venezianische Adel* 69, 131; for the second half of the thirteenth century, *ibid.* 225, and members of the Maggior Consiglio in CESSI, *DMC* I 280, 284, 291, 310, 317–318, 300, 306, 322, 324, 330, 345.

¹⁶² See G. LUZZATTO (ed.), *I prestiti della Repubblica di Venezia* (Sec. XIII–XV). Introduzione e documenti. Padova 1929, Documenti 5.

¹⁶³ *DCV* I, 237, no. 243: *Marcus Succugullo quondam filius Stephani Sucugullo de confinio Sancti Eustadii*.

¹⁶⁴ LUZZATTO, *I prestiti*. Documenti 15; A. LOMBARDO e R. MOROZZO DELLA ROCCA (eds.), *Nuovi documenti del commercio veneto dei s. XI–XIII*. Venezia 1953, 51–52, no. 45.

¹⁶⁵ See A. SCHAUBE, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge*. München 1906, 412, para. 321, who suggests that he was identical with the holder of Lampsakos, which seems most unlikely as this would imply that he abandoned his English fief and emigrated to Constantinople.

¹⁶⁶ *TTH* II 274–277, new ed. by M. POZZA, *I trattati con Aleppo 1207–1254* (*Pacta veneta* 2). Venezia 1990, 49–54; GERLAND, *Das Archiv* 77–78. As podestà in Constantinople Giacomo Tiepolo must have met the co-holders of Lampsakos, including Giovanni Succugullo. Other examples of Venetians residing overseas and sent on diplomatic missions in JACOBY, *L'expansion occidentale* 239.

¹⁶⁷ See above, 186.

holders of Lampsakos, was related to these members of his family. The only piece of information vaguely relevant to our subject is the presence of one of them in Romania some thirty years before the Fourth Crusade and the residence of another one in Constantinople in the mid-thirteenth century.

The exercise of Venice's authority in the Latin Empire

When the partition of the Latin Empire was devised in 1204, the basic unit adopted for a knight's fief was land producing a yearly revenue of 300 livres of Anjou¹⁶⁸. This sum was supposed to cover both the expenditure involved in mounted military service and the subsistence fitting the social standing of the knight and his household. It must have been more or less equivalent to the 1,000 hyperpers mentioned in the agreement concluded in 1269 between Emperor Baldwin II of Constantinople and Count Thibaud of Champagne, for which a knight's service was required¹⁶⁹. In 1219 each of the three grantees sharing Lampsakos was expected to enjoy a substantially lower income, barely 556 hyperpers, out of which he was ordered to pay 66 hyperpers to cover his military service¹⁷⁰. We may safely assume that when the podestà Marino Dandolo granted Lampsakos in 1214, he was convinced that the yield of the estate would be larger, possibly by some fifty percent¹⁷¹. Yet even if we increase the surveyor's estimate of 1219 by this percentage, the total revenue would have reached no more than 2,500 hyperpers, still below the income

¹⁶⁸ ROBERT DE CLARI, *La conquête* 102–103, para. CVII.

¹⁶⁹ *TTH* III 90–92: *pro quibuscumque iperperatis mille terre, ad communem extimationem Romanie seu Romani imperii (. . .) unum militem*; this document was issued in 1269, yet is dated 1268 according to Old Style: see D. JACOBY, *Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque*. *TM* 2 (1967) 449–450, repr. in idem, *Société et démographie*, no. VI; see also D. JACOBY, *The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade*. *American Historical Review* 78 (1973) 895–896, repr. in idem, *Recherches*, no. II. CARILE, *Per la storia* 203 and n. 121, suggests a yearly yield of some 1,300 hyperpers for the standard fief on the basis of the ratio between gold and silver apparently existing in 1204, yet there is no evidence for such a large revenue.

¹⁷⁰ See above, 171.

¹⁷¹ We have seen above that the revenue from some sources declined by half, yet the total reduction may have been smaller. Some additional calculations may offer a better understanding of the refusal of the holders of Lampsakos to render the service they owed. As in 1214 the podestà assumed a higher revenue than the actual one, let say by 50%, each of the three grantees would have been requested to pay more, i. e. 100 out of 834 hyperpers, his remaining receipts reaching 734 hyperpers. The sum they actually collected since 1214 was substantially lower, and by paying 100 out of 556 they would have been left with 456 hyperpers only.

of three standard knight's fiefs. Under these circumstances the effective performance of mandatory mounted military service would have been rather cumbersome, two out of the three grantees rendering it personally while some arrangement would still have to be found to cover the rest of the obligation burdening the estate¹⁷². A payment replacing the service was apparently more convenient to both the Commune and the individual grantees, and therefore adopted. The commutation of military service enabled the hiring of mercenaries in the service of the emperor, widely practiced in the Latin Empire¹⁷³. It would seem, though, that the main reason that prompted the podestà to impose a cash payment on the Venetian grantees of Lampsakos was their reluctance to perform military service. The meagre information we have about them will soon enable us to confirm this hypothesis.

There is no evidence that any of the Venetian holders of Lampsakos ever established himself on the estate. The social standing and occupations of the Querini strongly suggest that the grantees permanently resided in Constantinople, where they engaged in lucrative ventures and from where they occasionally sailed on maritime voyages. There is every reason to believe that they never delivered the mounted military service owed for Lampsakos; they presumably lacked the adequate training and inclination to do so. The podestà's statement of September 1219 regarding Lampsakos exclusively mentioned cash, namely arrears totalling 1,000 hyperpers. The absence of any reference to active military service, whether in the past or in the future, leads to the conclusion that this obligation had been commuted into a payment. This was a striking departure from the rules set down by Venice in 1204. The main reason must have been the reluctance of Venetian individuals to settle in Lampsakos, a somewhat outlying and isolated locality providing an income for a small number of fiefholders. Venetian fiefholders certainly felt more secure when living in large numbers in cities such as Rodosto¹⁷⁴. The concessions made by the Commune to the holders of Lampsakos may have neither been the only nor the first such case, which suggests that the original Venetian enfeoffment system had progressively been eroded. Another case in point is that of Giacomo Gradenigo, who also belonged to a prominent Venetian family. Since 1205 at the latest he resided in Constantinople and in 1207 held there the office of *consiliator*, like Giberto

¹⁷² The revenue of 1,670 hyperpers would have entailed the service of approximately one and a half fief.

¹⁷³ See LONGNON, *L'Empire latin* 133, 135.

¹⁷⁴ See above, 182.

Querini two years later. At the time of his death in 1221 he was registered as a fiefholder of Gallipoli, and in addition held real property in Constantinople and elsewhere in Romania. One may wonder whether he ever settled in Gallipoli or, rather, remained in Constantinople¹⁷⁵.

One may wonder, therefore, why the Commune bestowed Lampsakos upon three grantees who were neither willing to live on this estate nor to perform the military service that burdened it. The answers to these questions are related to Venice's overall policy with respect to landholding and enfeoffment in the Latin Empire. The main Venetian incentive for the acquisition of Lampsakos was undoubtedly connected to maritime activity in the Dardanelles. Yet once Venice had obtained the estate, which included agricultural land, it had to find ways to retain it under its own authority. Only by transferring estates to Venetian nationals or, if these were unavailable, to foreigners swearing fealty to the doge, could Venetian jurisdiction over them be maintained and their usurpation by the imperial administration be prevented. The successful implementation of this policy also reinforced the Commune's standing with respect to the emperor. The commutation of military service into a payment, as the least of evils, remained fully in line with these interests of the Commune. While the issue was primarily of a political nature, the fiscal benefits deriving from the exercise of territorial authority were not neglected. The Venetian podestà at Constantinople presumably deducted a certain sum from the amount he collected from the three fiefholders, before passing on the remainder to the imperial treasury to compensate it for the missing military service¹⁷⁶. As for the fiefholders, in fact though not formally, they served as the Commune's agents in Lampsakos: the holding of the estate required some form of supervision and presence, whether personally or by sending agents. Lampsakos constituted for the grantees no more than an additional source of income, which they presumably sought to maximize by increasing the output of the estate and by reducing as far as possible the costs of the latter's administration.

The consolidation and preservation of Venice's authority within its portion of the Latin Empire was not only a major Venetian concern with respect to the Latin emperor. It also was an important issue in the frame-

¹⁷⁵ For 1205, see *TTH* I 558. His widow claimed his assets in 1222, a year after his death; they included *cavaliarias et possessiones (. . .) et bona omnia et habere mobilia et immobilia (. . .) tam in Galipoli et ejus pertinentiis quam in Constantinopoli et alibi per totam Romaniam*: *TTH* II 249–250. The reference to the city of Gallipoli and its dependencies recalls the wording of the document dealing with disputed villages in this area: see above, n. 16.

¹⁷⁶ Though not documented, this arrangement seems quite plausible.

work of its relations with its own fiefholders. In practical terms, the survey of Lampsakos and the decision reached by the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo and his council in September 1219 were related to the renewal of the yearly payments owed by the grantees of the estate, yet beyond these fiscal aspects there was a re-affirmation of the Commune's jurisdiction both over this territory and its beneficiaries. The same holds true of the podestà's intervention in Rodosto, which took place about a month later, although in this case the challenge to Venice's authority was far more serious. The establishment of an autonomous commune by the fiefholders of Rodosto not only deprived the podestà of state income, but also severely curtailed the exercise of his political authority in a city that was vital for the maintenance of Venetian control over maritime traffic and, in general, for Venice's standing in the Empire. The measures implemented by Giacomo Tiepolo in the territories of Lampsakos and Rodosto during his first term of office as podestà at Constantinople, which extended from 1218 to 1220 or 1221¹⁷⁷, constituted a determined return to a highly centralized system of supervision over Venetian interests and nationals in the Latin Empire, after several years of laxity and mismanagement by some of his predecessors. These measures were primarily motivated by internal considerations and related to the specific policy implemented by Tiepolo. We may thus safely reject the suggestion that Venice took advantage of the severe crisis in imperial rule following the death of emperor Henry in 1216 to impose its authority over Lampsakos and Rodosto¹⁷⁸. There was no connection whatsoever between this crisis and the measures devised in 1219 with respect to Lampsakos, for the simple reason that the latter were related, as we have seen, to the holding of the estate by Venice since 1214 at the latest, two years before the emperor's death. Neither was there a link between the crisis in imperial rule and the reaffirmation of Venice's authority in Rodosto. The Latin emperors never exercised any jurisdiction over this city, which belonged to Venice's portion of the Empire, nor did they ever attempt to wrest it from Venetian control.

We have seen that in all likelihood Giacomo Tiepolo was the podestà who complained to Doge Pietro Ziani, possibly in the autumn of 1218, about the refusal of the holders of Lampsakos to hand in their yearly payments, and thereby set in motion the whole procedure that generated the arrangement of September 1219. In Rodosto, on the other hand, Tiepolo apparently took action without waiting for instructions, and this

¹⁷⁷ See above, n. 91.

¹⁷⁸ As claimed by BORSARI, *Studi* 92, n. 22.

also seems to have been the case with his seizure of land belonging to the Patriarch of Grado in Constantinople, on which he began to build a new *fundicium* or public warehouse shortly before June 1220¹⁷⁹. The future doge pursued even more vigorously the same policy during his second term of office as podestà, which presumably began in the autumn of 1223 and lasted in 1224. He diligently reported to Venice about the state of the Commune's affairs in the Latin Empire and apparently suggested a whole series of measures, that were subsequently adopted by the doge and his council. Shortly after his arrival in Constantinople Giacomo Tiepolo voiced his suspicion that public funds had been embezzled while Marino Dandolo was serving as podestà, thus around 1214. In February 1224 the doge ordered Tiepolo to conduct a thorough inquiry into the matter¹⁸⁰. A few months later, in July of the same year, the doge and his council dealt with other important issues: the redress of past judicial grievances and financial excesses committed by Giacomo Tiepolo's predecessors in Constantinople; the choice of the captains of Rodosto and Gallipoli by electors appointed by the podestà, which implies a reform in the government of these two cities; finally, property in Constantinople as well as other matters¹⁸¹. The podestà's policy of centralization in Romania heralded his later energetic assertion of the Commune's authority when serving as doge from 1229 to 1249¹⁸².

It has been claimed that while recognizing the nominal authority of the doge, the Venetian officers serving as podestà in Constantinople after the death of Enrico Dandolo in 1205 enjoyed a strong standing in relation to the government in Venice until about 1225. Moreover, some of these officers are considered to have harboured autonomous or even separatist aspirations, in particular Marino Zeno and Giacomo Tiepolo who, ac-

¹⁷⁹ CORNELIUS, *Ecclesiae venetae* III 99: letter by Giacomo Tiepolo, dated June 1220. He is attested in Constantinople as late as January 1221: *TTH* II 225–226.

¹⁸⁰ CESSI, *DMC* I 9, no. 24. To be sure, this text refers in general terms only to suspicions (*dicebatur*), yet the information must have come from Constantinople, which explains the instructions sent to Giacomo Tiepolo. As these were adopted in February 1220, the podestà arrived in Romania several months earlier. On his presence in Constantinople in 1224, see WOLFF, *A New Document*, 561, and see above, n. 68. Marino Dandolo was the podestà who granted Lampsakos in April 1214: see above, 168.

¹⁸¹ CESSI, *DMC* I 66–67, no. 69, in the *Liber Plegiorum: de capitaneo* [sic, to be read *capitaneis*] *Rodisto et Galipoli, ut elegi debeant per electores potestatis*. The language is somewhat ambiguous, yet it certainly refers to electors appointed in Romania by the podestà himself, whose authority extended over Rodosto and Gallipoli, and not to the electors in Venice choosing the podestà sent to Constantinople.

¹⁸² See CRACCO, *Società e stato* 158–173. THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne* 93–99, does not present a satisfactory assessment of his overseas policies during this period.

according to this line of argument, displayed similar attitudes and used similar political and symbolic elements to enhance their position¹⁸³. There is indeed some degree of continuity in this field, yet the circumstances during their respective terms of office were entirely different. The conditions existing in the Latin Empire at the time of Dandolo's death account for the speed at which the Venetians and the foreigners in Venetian service who were present in Constantinople chose Marino Zeno as podestà in June 1205¹⁸⁴. The Latin Empire was then in the midst of a severe crisis due to military setbacks. It was essential, therefore, for these Venetians and those affiliated with them to retain their cohesion and maintain thereby their collective standing as a political and military force in the Empire, without waiting for an officer sent from Venice. Yet barely three months later, by the end of September, the Venetian group in the Empire agreed that in the future only such an officer would hold the office of podestà in Constantinople. All of Zeno's successors since 1207 swore allegiance to the doges and fully recognized their authority¹⁸⁵.

While submitting to the authority of the Commune, Marino Zeno nevertheless attempted to bolster his position. We have already noted that since his election in June 1205 Marino Zeno assumed the title *Dei gratia Venetorum potestas in Romania, ejusdem imperii quarte partis et dimidie dominator*. This title defined the territorial extent of his authority, without any reference to the doge of Venice nor to the ruling vice-doge Ranieri Dandolo. In October of the same year, however, Marino Zeno yielded to the pressure of the vice-doge. He made substantial concessions to the Venetian Commune, which severely curtailed the region over which he exercised his authority, yet the very wording of his declaration implied a territorial division in this respect between himself and the central government of Venice¹⁸⁶. This division did clearly not amount to an affirmation of autonomy with respect to the doge, nor was such an assertion expressed by Zeno's use of the title *dominator* and other regalian elements¹⁸⁷.

The claims regarding the so-called autonomous policy of the podestà Giacomo Tiepolo are largely based on two documents. In the first one, the treaty he concluded with Nicaea in August 1219, Theodore I Laskaris

¹⁸³ See in particular *ibid.* 79–81, 90–92, who goes so far as to claim that Tiepolo eventually “capitulated” under the pressure of the central government; also BORSARI, *Studi* 17–20, 85–91.

¹⁸⁴ On the participation of non-Venetians, see above, 154.

¹⁸⁵ See WOLFF, *A New Document* 556–558.

¹⁸⁶ *TTH* I 569–571.

¹⁸⁷ See above, 148.

obviously used diplomatic language requested by Tiepolo: he referred to the territories of the podestà's *dominatio* or region under his rule, without explicitly mentioning that of Venice. The second document is a chrysobull issued by Tiepolo, which records his treaty with the Sultan of Konya in March 1220; the podestà signed this document in red ink and affixed to it his golden seal, all in true Byzantine imperial style¹⁸⁸. Several factors, however, dispel the contention that the podestà pursued an autonomous course disregarding Venice's central government. First, it should be stressed that Giacomo Tiepolo personally initiated and conducted negotiations with these foreign rulers, and not envoys sent by the doge. Under these circumstances it was important for him to boost his standing by the use of appropriate imperial insignia and other symbolic elements. In all his dealings, however, he appeared as the doge's representative. The chronology of events reveals that his was not merely a nominal allegiance to the Venetian head of state. The treaty with Nicaea was signed in the period extending between Giacomo Tiepolo's letter to Venice complaining about the grantees of Lampsakos, and his report of September 1219 to the doge about the fiscal survey of the estate, carried out according to the latter's instructions. The podestà soon forwarded this letter to the doge together with information about other matters. In addition, in December 1219 he sent him a detailed report about political and ecclesiastical developments in the Latin Empire and about his own action aiming at the restoration of the Commune's full authority in Rodosto, some two months earlier¹⁸⁹. There is no reason to believe, therefore, that his relations with Venice had radically changed by March 1220, when he concluded his second treaty, and that by then he had adopted a course of his own. Giacomo Tiepolo's subordination to the central government and the latter's trust in him are also displayed by his election as podestà for a second term of office, in 1223 at the latest¹⁹⁰. His whole behaviour during both his tenures in Constantinople illustrates his close and permanent cooperation with Venice and his full recognition of the doge's supreme authority. Finally, Tiepolo's use of imperial elements in both treaties mentioned above should be viewed in the same perspective as Marino Zeno's use of them. It clearly points to the projection both within and outside the Latin Empire of a quasi-imperial standing, which did not

¹⁸⁸ *TTH* II 205–207 and 221–225 (both misdated by THIRIET, *La Romanie vénitienne*, p. 90).

¹⁸⁹ *TTH* II 216–221. On the Latin Church, see WOLFF, *Politics in the Latin Patriarchate* 264–267.

¹⁹⁰ See above, 193.

challenge nor curtail the doge's rule over Venetian property and nationals in Romania.

Conclusion: the long-term perspective

Venice's participation in the Fourth Crusade and its subsequent insertion within the government and institutional network of the Latin Empire were characterized by a large degree of flexibility and pragmatism, as well as by a combination of continuity and adaptation on various levels. Venice faced the challenge of western feudalism, a political and social system fundamentally different from its own, long before the Fourth Crusade. Since 1124 or 1125 its portion of the lordship of Tyre was integrated within the feudal framework of the Kingdom of Jerusalem, a state headed by a non-Venetian ruler. Venice introduced in this portion, for its own use, institutions, terminology and practices borrowed from the feudal kingdom, because they suited its political and military needs. There is good reason to believe that the experience gathered in the Crusader Levant facilitated Venice's implementation of such practices in the Latin Empire, where its portion and fiefholders were similarly inserted within a feudal network headed by a foreign ruler. However, losses suffered in the Latin Empire in 1204–1205 or in the lordship of Tyre in the twelfth century may have induced Venice to devise an original pattern of relations with the emperors and Venetian nationals or dependents in the Latin Empire, different from the one existing in the Kingdom of Jerusalem. This pattern buttressed Venice's position as a major political force within the Empire, ensured that its main representatives achieved institutional and symbolic parity or quasi-parity with the emperor and, moreover, prevented encroachments on the Commune's property, jurisdiction and interests. The Venetian enfeoffment policy was crucial in this respect. It apparently combined the perpetuation of the military organization based on the *sestieri* or quarters of Venice, devised on the eve of the Fourth Crusade, with the requirements of the mandatory military service owed by the Commune's fiefholders to the Latin emperor. Venetians and foreigners who swore fealty to the doge were granted land within the Venetian portion of the Empire, in return for military service or payments replacing it. The Venetian state fulfilled a vital role as intermediary between its own fiefholders and the emperor, which enabled it to exercise its authority over its own portion of the Empire. This role is illustrated in the peninsula of Gallipoli, as well as in the cities of Rodosto, Lampsakos, and their countryside.

Lampsakos is the only estate belonging to the Venetian portion of the

Empire for which it is more or less possible to reconstruct the procedure involved in the grant of a Venetian fief in the first decades of existence of the Latin Empire. It should be stressed, however, that the obligations of its holders since 1214 were not typical of those imposed on the grantees of Venetian fiefs soon after 1204. They lacked the military function originally assigned to the Venetian fiefs and did not conform with the overall settlement policy implemented by Venice, as the grantees were liable to a service in cash only and were apparently authorized to maintain their permanent residence in Constantinople. The survey of Lampsakos carried out in 1219 reflects both the continuity of the Byzantine fiscal system and its adaptation to the conceptions introduced by the conquering feudal élite, which were largely adopted by Venice in the Latin Empire. Indeed, in matters pertaining to peasant tenures, the exploitation of the land and other resources as well as taxation the Venetian authorities largely relied upon, and preserved Byzantine practices, yet like the feudal lords settled in the Latin Empire they privatized fiscal prerogatives that had previously belonged to the Byzantine state. It should be stressed, however, that in the Venetian portion of the Empire the existence of military tenures did not lead to feudalization. Venice maintained strict control and full jurisdiction over its fiefs and fiefholders, all directly subjected to its exclusive authority. The absence of homage and of a personal hierarchy within the Venetian body of fiefholders further differentiated this group from the feudal network composed of knights and headed by the Latin emperor.

Venice's presence in the Empire was thus partly moulded by its past encounters with feudal institutions, practices and terminology, particularly in the eastern Mediterranean. Yet its own experience in the Empire also served as a weighty precedent that shaped its policies in the following years in other areas of Romania, in which different political conditions existed. We have briefly noted the components of these policies as implemented in some of the territories overseas in which Venice exercised its direct authority, namely Corfu since 1207 and Crete since 1211. Venice also introduced feudal elements into other territories over which it had no direct control. Since 1209 various feudal lords of Negroponte or Euboea acknowledged the doge's overlordship by taking an oath of fealty and promising him yearly payments, thereby enabling Venice to intervene in feudal disputes in the island. Venice gradually extended its authority over Negroponte and other Aegean islands by expanding its jurisdiction in feudal cases on the basis of the feudal law of Frankish Morea, compiled between 1333 and 1346 and preserved in the so-called "Assizes of

Romania"¹⁹¹. By the fifteenth century Venice was applying this law in all its colonies of Romania, with the exception of Crete¹⁹².

APPENDIX: SOURCES ON LAMPSAKOS IN 1219

A. Venetian fiscal survey, undated [1219, September at the latest]¹⁹³.

ASV, *Liber Pactorum* I [= *LP* I], fol. 159r-v (around 1220); *Liber Pactorum* II [= *LP* II], fol. 170v-171r (late thirteenth or early fourteenth century); *Liber Albus* [= *LA*], 54r-v (presumably after 1345). In all three cases the reference is to the new numbering of the folios¹⁹⁴.

First edition, entitled *Tributa Lampsacenorum*, by *TTh* II 208-209, based on *LA*; late copies of *LP* I and II were used for the collation. *USPENSKIJ*, *Sledi piscovich knig*, 290-291, relied on a copy made at the *ASV*. Two segments have been newly edited according to *LP* I by *BORSARI*, *Studi* 115, n. 29, and 119, n. 43. The full text has been edited twice, based on the same manuscript, by *A. CARILE*, *La rendita feudale nella Morea latina del XIV secolo*. Bologna 1974, 99-101, n. 296, and in *Per la storia* 398-400. None of these editions is entirely satisfactory.

My own edition below is based on the copy in *LP* I, not only because it is the most ancient, but also the most reliable of the three copies. The best indication in this respect is the reference to Olkos, where the shipyard in the vicinity of Lampsakos was located (A, 11)¹⁹⁵. The reading *Olco*, common to *LP* I and II, was transformed into *oleo* by the copyist of *LA* who was not familiar with the name of this locality. A transition in the opposite direction, from the erroneous *oleo* to the correct *Olco*, is simply excluded. The dependence of *LA* on *LP* I is illustrated by the common error *ponumus* (A, 8).

The survey is faithfully reproduced here from *LP* I, even when erroneous from a grammatical point of view or incomprehensible. Some additions and corrections, however, have proved indispensable as they improve the reading of the text; they appear between square brackets.

¹⁹¹ See D. JACOBY, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les «Assises de Romanie»: sources, application et diffusion*. Paris - La Haye 1971 187-204, and for the dating 75-82.

¹⁹² See *ibid.* 204-308.

¹⁹³ For this dating, see above, 166, 169-170.

¹⁹⁴ For the dating of the manuscripts, see above, n. 103.

¹⁹⁵ See above, 165, 179.

For the sake of clarity capitals and a new punctuation have been introduced, and the definite articles *lu*, *li*, *la* and *le* preceding fiscal terms are reproduced separately, even if they are joined in the manuscript; full stops preceding and following the numbers have been omitted, because they are superfluous and also cumbersome from a typographical point of view. Finally, it should be noted that the numbering of the lines below does not correspond to the disposition of the text in the manuscript; it refers to items and is intended to enable a better understanding of, and convenient references to the content.

1	Anno domini [MCCXIX] ¹⁹⁶	inveni in Lapsaco	
2	Homines	LX	reddent perperos LI et karatos VI ¹⁹⁷
3	et sunt çeugarati	XXI	perperos CCVIII
4	et sunt voidati	LII	perperos CCLI
5	et sunt actimones	XVIII	perperos XLVIII ÷
6	apori	XXII	perperos XXII ÷
7		summa:	perperi DLXXXI et karati VI
8	Item li molenee sunt VII, quos ponumus		perperos XXXV
9	li saline		perperos XXXIIIJ, que sunt saline XVI
10	lu skillofacto et chersochorio		perperos XVII, et tantum fuit positum per ¹⁹⁸ practico
11	lu vivaro de Olco		perperos XX
12	lu grippovoli de lu nasgidio		perperos XXV
13	lu vathi		perperos XIII
14	la piscaria de Ierusalem		perperos III
15		summa:	perperi CXLVIIIJ
16	De CXX plinthis de vineis quas receperunt pro anacapsi		perperos [XX]VIII ¹⁹⁹ annuatim
17	de quibus habent ipsi annuatim		perperos XIII
18	et etiam de suprascriptis plinthis tenent eos pro		p[er] eos plinthis XXIII super perperis VI et karatis VI

¹⁹⁶ There is no lacuna in the manuscript, despite the omission of the year 1219.

¹⁹⁷ The hyperpyron appears in contemporary Venetian documents in the masculine form: see e. g. *DCV* II 109–110, no. 566 (April 1217).

¹⁹⁸ This is the correct reading from a paleographic point of view, and not *pro*, as suggested by previous editors who conjectured that the ending of the word *practico* reflected the Latin ablative case following this preposition; in fact, the ending reflects the Greek original *πρακτικό[v]*, which remained unchanged in the accusative required after *per*.

¹⁹⁹ For the correction, see above, n. 134.

- ²⁰² No lacuna in the manuscript. The addition is supported by the following calculation, made by BORSARI, Studi 119, n. 43: the *angarie* of the 73 *çeugarati* and *voidati* were valued at 292 hyperpers (73 × 4); as the total estimate was 310 hyperpers, the 18 *actimones* were supposed to add 18 hyperpers, or one each.

38 summa tota suprascripta ratio: perperi MDCLXXI
et karati VI cum angariis.

Variants:

line 4: *LP* II vodati; line 8: *LP* II ponimus; line 11: *LA* oleo; line 14: *LA* Iherusalem;
line 17: *LP* II annuati; line 18: *LP* II p[er] eos *deest*; line 19: *LP* II rationem; line 20: *LP* II
iusticias; line 26: *LA* cum psum (instead of *cum psuni*); line 27: *LP* II fuerut; line 28: *LP* II
compositis; line 37: *LA* angarie; line 38: *LP* II ratio.

B. Statement in the name of the Venetian podestà of Constantinople,
[Giacomo Tiepolo,] September of the seventh indiction, [1219].

ASV, *LP* I, fol. 159v–160r; *LP* II, fol. 171r; *LA*, fol. 54v–55r; in all
three cases the reference is to the new numbering of the folios.

Edition by *TTh* II 209–210, based on *LA*; *USPENSKIJ*, *Sledi piscovich*
knig 291–292, relied on a copy made at the *ASV*.

Mense Septembris, VII indictione.

Scripsi ex precepto domini potestatis et maioris partis sui consilii,
quod ipse dominus potestas cum maiore parte sui consilii super litteras
domini nostri ducis, quas ipse dominus dux miserat ei pro facto terre de
Lapsaco inquirendo et ordinando; quam terram tenent viri nobiles
G. Quirinus, J. Succugullo et J. Quirinus filius domini P. Quirini.

Talem finem posuerunt, quod ipsi tres viri debent servire annuatim
pro eadem terra amodo in antea pro perperis eiusdem introitus
MDCLXX, et ut ipsi viri debeant solvere de debito perperorum transacti
temporis, quod dare tenentur comuni Venecie yperperos auri pensantes M
per talem ordinem, videlicet: ab hinc usque ad festum Nativitatis domini
nostri Ihesu Christi perperos CCC, idem Nativitatis primi venturi, et ab
eodem festo Nativitatis usque ad Pasca resurrectionis alios perperos
aureos pensantes CCC, et alios remanentes CCCC perperos auri pensantes
ab eodem festo de Pasca in antea, per illum modum et ordinem per quem
voluerit dominus constantinopolitanus potestas per maiorem partem sui
consilii.

VII

VENETIAN SETTLERS IN LATIN CONSTANTINOPLE (1204-1261) RICH OR POOR?

The Latin siege of 1203-1204 and the conquest of Constantinople in April 1204 had a considerable impact on the city's urban development in the following decades. Extensive fires inflicted heavy damage upon large sections of the city, as well as upon the latter's commercial and industrial infrastructure. In addition, there was a massive exodus of inhabitants belonging to all social strata. The loss of population was only partly compensated by the rather meagre flow of Latin immigration that followed, and many houses remained empty. Neither the Latin imperial court nor the Latin social elite could indulge in conspicuous consumption on a scale comparable to that of their Byzantine predecessors, nor did they invest in industrial ventures. As a result of these developments, there was a substantial contraction in the city's economy, only partly overcome in the course of the Latin period.¹

A recent study argues that the new circumstances and the worsening political and territorial conditions of the Latin Empire, especially since the 1220s, generated a decline in Venetian trade in Constantinople. Since its author found no contracts dealing with long-distance commerce in connection with the city in the years 1233-1261, she concluded that Venetian businessmen made only little profit in Constantinople and deserted its markets in that period. She further claimed that declining real estate values provide additional evidence in this respect.² These propositions are highly questionable. For lack of space, however, only some of their aspects

1. The economic evolution of Latin Constantinople will be extensively treated in a forthcoming study.

2. L. B. Robbert, *Rialto Businessmen and Constantinople, 1204-61*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 49 (1995) 43-58.

will be challenged in the present study, which is based on a new reading of known sources and the addition of newly discovered documents.³

It may prove useful to examine at first the economic activity of a few Venetians who settled in Constantinople in the first years after the Latin conquest. Zaccaria Stanuario had been personally acquainted with trade conditions in the city since 1199. He possibly participated with his ship in the Fourth Crusade, after which the volume of his business substantially increased. Both he and his wife Maria or Mariota settled in Constantinople in 1206 or 1207. In that year he served as one of the councillors to the Venetian podestà, the representative of Venice's doge in the Latin Empire.⁴ From this base Zaccaria conducted trade and invested in business ventures both in the Mediterranean and in the Black Sea. Sometime before September 1219 he returned to Venice, where he gave power of attorney to a fellow-Venetian to collect all the money owed to him, as well as to rent or sell his land, houses and other property in Constantinople.⁵

3. Abbreviations used in this study: *DCV* = R. Morozzo della Rocca - A. Lombardo (eds.), *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI-XIII*, Torino 1940; *NDCV* = A. Lombardo e R. Morozzo della Rocca (eds.), *Nuovi documenti del commercio veneto dei sec. XI-XIII*, Venezia 1953; *TTh* = G. L. Fr. Tafel und G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Wien 1856-1857; finally, Maltezou = Chr. Maltezou, Il quartiere veneziano di Costantinopoli (Scali marittimi), *Thesaurismata* 15 (1978) 30-61, who quotes topographical data from a number of unpublished thirteenth-century documents. For the sake of convenience, I refer to their respective number in that study, yet base my arguments on their full text. Unpublished charters are mentioned below according to their location: *ASV* = Archivio di Stato, Venice, and *MP* = Mensa Patriarcale, a section of the latter; *ASP* = Archivio di Stato, Padua.

4. On the podestà, see R. L. Wolff, A New Document from the Period of the Latin Empire of Constantinople. The Oath of the Venetian Podestà, *Annuaire de l'Institut de philologie et d'histoire orientales et slaves* 12 (1952) (= *Mélanges Henri Grégoire*, IV), 539-573, repr. in idem, *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople*, London 1976, no. VI.

5. *DCV*, nos. 467, 478-479, 486 (reference to his wife), 487, 490, 492-493, 517, 519, 526, 531, 541, 566, 572 and 585 (1219); *TTh*, II, 4-8, esp. 7. See also S. Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici*, Venezia

Giovanni Martinacio, member of a high-ranking Venetian family, was also among the early settlers.⁶ He is attested in Constantinople in June 1205 and was there in all likelihood some time before April 1207, when as member of a group of Venetian citizens he loaned a large sum to the Commune. It should be noted that the individual shares, the total of which amounted to 24,450 ¹/₃ Venetian pounds, were to be reimbursed in Constantinople within one month after the freshly appointed Ottaviano Querini would assume the office of Venetian podestà in that city.⁷ The operation was clearly devised as a transfer of liquid capital enabling the creditors or their representatives to invest substantial sums in trade and real estate in Constantinople. It thus provides convincing evidence to the resumption of commercial activity in the city on a fairly large scale within two years after the Latin conquest. Giovanni Martinacio must have had large resources for the conduct of his business in and from Constantinople, beyond the 2,000 Venetian pounds which he loaned to the state. In March 1209 he was serving there as *camerarius* of the Commune, and later extended a commercial loan for a round trip to Negroponte, completed by April 1211. He must have resided continuously in Constantinople throughout all these years, and apparently returned to Venice shortly before 1232. In that year he decided to sell his stately stone mansion in Constantinople, built on land belonging to the church of S. Nicolò dell'Embolo in the heart of the old Venetian quarter.⁸

1988, 113-116, who fails however to note Zaccaria's settlement in Constantinople, and D. Jacoby, *La dimensione demografica e sociale*, in G. Cracco - G. Ortalli (eds.), *Storia di Venezia. II. L'età del Comune*, Roma 1995, 698. Zaccaria's wife presumably returned together with him to Venice, where she is attested as a widow in 1228 and 1231: Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 113 and 143-145, nos. 7-8. On the officials assisting the podestà, see Wolff, *A New Document*, 552-559, 565-573.

6. On such families mentioned in the present study, see G. Rösch, *Der venezianische Adel bis zur Schliessung des Grossen Rats. Zur Genese einer Führungsschicht*, Sigmaringen 1989.

7. TTh, I, 558-561, esp. 560; *DCV*, no. 485.

8. F. Cornelius [Corner] (ed.), *Ecclesiae venetae antiquis monumentis nunc etiam illustratae*, Venezia 1749-1753, XIV, 219; *DCV*, nos. 530, 661. On the location of S. Nicolò dell'Embolo, presumably constructed by the Venetians

The third Venetian who warrants our attention at this stage is Giberto Querini.⁹ He settled in Constantinople in 1209 at the latest, at which time he served as councillor to the podestà, although being presumably only in his late twenties. While continuing to reside in the city he held jointly with two other Venetians the fief of Lampsakos, on the Asian shore of the Dardanelles, from April 1214 up to 1224, his portion of the annual yield amounting to some 490 hyperpers.¹⁰ In Constantinople in March 1232 he empowered his elder son Pietro to conduct business in his name.¹¹ Since June 1239 at the latest he acted as agent for the patriarch of Grado, his brother Leonardo, and as such was entrusted with the administration of the extensive property the patriarchate owned in Constantinople. He is attested in this capacity between March 1240 and January 1242, leasing land and other assets to Venetians and foreigners and collecting rents.¹² On 30 April 1240 he lodged a formal protest against a move ordered by the podestà Giovanni Michiel with respect to some of the patriarchate's property.¹³ On 9 January 1242 Giberto emancipated his younger son Nicolò, who must have been then in his twenties and was thus a native of Constantinople.¹⁴ He returned to Venice a widower sometime be-

in the twelfth century, see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 32-33. One Giovanni Martinacio residing in Venice served as *judez* in September 1211 and as *advocator* of the Commune in March 1212: TTh, II, 129-136, 146-150, esp. 136, 149. G. Cracco, *Società e stato nel medioevo veneziano*, Firenze 1967, 116, identifies him with the one mentioned here, yet in view of the evidence bearing on Constantinople, adduced above, he appears to be a namesake.

* 9. For what follows, see D. Jacoby, The Venetian Presence in the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204-1261): the Challenge of Feudalism and the Byzantine Inheritance, *Jahrbuch der Österreichischen Byzantinistik* 43 (1993) 184-187.

10. *Ibid.*, 164-173, esp. 171.

11. Somewhat later, in July 1232, Pietro received in Venice a loan of 100 pounds for one year: A.S.V., *Procuratori di S. Marco de Ultra*, b. 211.

12. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, cc. 28-32 = Maltezou, nos. 41, 43-46, who, however, mentions Giberto only in three out of five cases. Giberto was appointed agent in May 1239, as noted in these documents, yet it took several weeks until the news reached Constantinople.

13. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 29 = Maltezou, no. 42, and for details see below, 192.

14. A.S.V., *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8.

tween 1242 and 1252, most likely after the death of his brother Patriarch Leonardo Querini on 28 August 1250,¹⁵ which entailed the loss of his own function as the latter's agent. By then he had become prosperous, owning several plots of land and houses in Constantinople. It is noteworthy that this property was not located on the patriarchate's land,¹⁶ yet nevertheless within the enlarged Venetian quarter.

To be sure, some Venetian settlers left Constantinople after a short period of residence, yet others such as the three individuals just mentioned remained there for many years. In the thirteenth century the return of expatriates to Venice after a long period of absence or in old age was fairly common among Venetians operating overseas. In 1219 Zaccaria Stanuario retired from business after at least forty-five years of activity, while Giberto Querini must have been in his sixties when he acted likewise between 1242 and 1252 or, more likely, between 1250 and 1252. No similar information is available for Giovanni Martinacio. In any event, there is good reason to believe that the departure from Constantinople of these three was not prompted by a decline in the city's economy. It is noteworthy that Domenico Pistello, who like Giovanni Martinacio had loaned a sum to the Commune prior to April 1207, was still in Constantinople in 1240, his house being located on land belonging to the patriarchate of Grado. He had previously conducted business from Constantinople, serving as captain on a ship sailing to Syria in July 1207 and on another one returning from Venice to Constantinople in July 1210.¹⁷ As for Giberto Querini, he divided his assets in the city between his two sons. Pietro presumably returned to Venice together with him,¹⁸ yet Nicolò,

15. C. Eubel, *Hierarchia catholica medii aevi*², Münster 1913-1914, I, 265-266.

16. Its location will be examined in a forthcoming study: D. Jacoby, *The Venetian Quarter of Constantinople from 1082 to 1261: Topographical Considerations*, in C. Sode and S. A. Takács (éds.), *Novum Millenium*, Aldershot, Hampshire, 1999.

17. *DCV*, nos. 485, 491, 520. His house is registered in area B of a cadaster compiled in 1240 or 1241: *TTh*, II, 9; on this dating, see below 192-193.

18. In 1232 Pietro was still based in Constantinople: see document mentioned above, n. 11.

who remained in Constantinople, bought on 28 March 1252 some of his brother's property in the city, namely a mansion and two pieces of land, for 60 hyperpers.¹⁹ He thus clearly considered the prevailing economic conditions in Constantinople favorable to the pursuit of his activity, most likely in conjunction with his brother residing in Venice. Such business strategies were common in the thirteenth century among members of Venetian families, whose dispersion promoted commercial activity.²⁰

Nicolo's favorable assessment of economic prospects in Constantinople was shared both earlier and later by other Venetians and explains the continuation of Venetian immigration in the last decades of Latin rule. Marco Romano of the parish of S. Baseggio in Venice settled in Constantinople shortly before March 1232, when he received a loan for trade in the Black Sea.²¹ Paolo Navigaioso and his wife Giacomina established themselves in the city between 1223 and 1245,²² and Luca Longo left the Venetian parish of S. Cassian in the 1230s or 1240s.²³ Giovanni Venier from the parish of Santi Apostoli was settled in Constantinople by 1232. The following year he lost in a major business transaction most of the 772 $\frac{1}{2}$ Venetian *libre denariorum* he had obtained in Venice from nine investors. The latter refused to accept as settlement the small sums he sent them. Giovanni's failure was a personal one

19. A.S.V., *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8, no. 19.

20. See other cases in Jacoby, *The Venetian Presence*, 183-184; idem, *L'expansion occidentale dans le Levant: les Vénitiens à Acre dans la seconde moitié du treizième siècle*, *Journal of Medieval History* 3 (1977) 239-245, repr. in idem, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies*, London 1979, no. VII; idem, *The Rise of a New Emporium in the Eastern Mediterranean: Famagusta in the Late Thirteenth Century*, *Μελέται καὶ ὑπομνήματα* ("Ἰδρυμα ἀρχιεπισκόπου Μακαρίου Γ'), 1 (1984) 168, repr. in idem, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion*, Northampton 1989, no. VIII; idem, *La dimensione demografica e sociale*, 703.

21. *DCV*, no. 662: *modo vero habitatore in Constantinopoli*, *modo* or 'now' pointing to a fairly recent arrival.

22. *Ibid.*, no. 805 (16 March 1251): *Giacomina nunc habitatrix in Constantinopoli*, with references to residence in Venice in 1223 and in Constantinople in 1245.

23. He had been *postmodum habitator* in Constantinople, as stated there by his widow Maria shortly after his death in 1254: A.S.V., *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8, no. 21.

and, therefore, does not reflect a depressed state of Constantinople's economy in 1233, as has been argued.²⁴ This is confirmed by some evidence adduced below.

The sons of Giovanni Venier remained in Constantinople. Marco Venier is attested sometime before August 1250 in the area of Petrion, where his brother Stefano also lived.²⁵ This section of the city extending along the Golden Horn had been added to the old Venetian quarter after the Latin conquest of 1204.²⁶ On 20 February

24. A.S.P., *Archivio Diplomatico*, nos. 1400, 1419, 1424-1427; A.S.V., *Santo Stefano*, b. 1 perg.; *NDCV*, no. 86. Relying especially on this last document, Robbert, *Rialto Businessmen and Constantinople*, 45, argues that the payment was to be made in gold and that the creditor refused the offer made by Venier because the latter had applied an unfavorable rate of exchange. Her far-reaching conclusions are that "the markets had no confidence" in the gold currency of Constantinople and that "the credit of the Latin Empire was very poor". It should be stressed, however, that since Venier was based in Constantinople, he only referred to *karatos auri (...) ad pondus de Constantino- poli* as money of account to express the rate of exchange he used, that he offered payments in *Venetian* currency, and that the creditors refused them because they represented a small fraction only of the capital they had invested. In the specific case mentioned in *NDCV*, no. 86, Venier sent 18 *denarii grossi*, which at the rate of 26 *denarii* to the *grosso* amounted to no more than 1.95 percent of the initial 100 pounds *denariorum venecialium* ([18 × 26 *denarii*]: 240 *denarii* per pound). For the rate of the *grosso*, see L. B. Robbert, *The Venetian Money Market, 1150-1229*, *Studi Veneziani* 13 (1971) 45. The reimbursement would have remained small even with an improved rate of exchange. Venier stated in some of the documents that *meliolem rationem eis facere non possum*.

25. Injunction of Doge Marino Morosini issued on 29 August 1250 regarding Marco Venier residing in *Constantinopoli in loco Petriis*, included in a document issued by the podestà Marco Gausoni: A.S.P., *Archivio Diplomatico*, no. 1924. Marco already acted on behalf of his father in 1233: *NDCV*, no. 86. A document of 1266, thus issued after the Byzantine reconquest of Constantinople, refers to Stefano Venier as *olim habitator Constantinopoli in loco Petrum*: A.S.P., *Archivio Diplomatico*, nos. 2234-2235.

26. Location in R. Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*², Paris 1964, 407-408. Along the Golden Horn the enlarged Venetian quarter reached the Blachernae, as implied by a grant made by the Commune to the Venetian monastery of S. Giorgio Maggiore in February 1208: TTh, II, 47-49, and III, 23-24; new ed. and correct dating of the first document in M. Pozza, *Gli atti originali della cancelleria veneziana. II. 1205-1227*, Venezia 1996, 39-41, no. 7. Petrion had been strongly affected by the fire of 1203: see Th. F. Madden, *The Fires of*

1251 the podestà Marco Gausoni summoned Marco Venier to appear before him *infra Pantogratores*, i.e. in the monastery of the Pantokrator, where his council convened to deal with judicial matters.²⁷ In September 1254 Marco and Stefano Venier dissolved in Constantinople the *fraterna compagna* or fraternal association joining them in business, yet retained the common ownership of their paternal house in Venice,²⁸ and on 18 August 1259, again in Constantinople, Stefano ended a similar partnership binding him to his other brother Giacomo.²⁹ Marco and Stefano fled Constantinople and were in Negroponte in August 1261.³⁰ Another Venetian merchant, Stefano da Niola, must have settled in Constantinople in the last decade of Latin rule.³¹ He is first attested as *habitor* of that city in December 1260, together with another newcomer, Pietro de la Calcina.³² They too fled in 1261 to Negroponte, where Stefano had several relatives.³³ In sum, despite the return home of

the Fourth Crusade in Constantinople. 1203-1204: A Damage Assessment, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991/1992) 73-74, 93 (map).

27. See above, n. 25. The document offers new information about the Pantokrator and its function as the center of Venetian administration in the Latin period, beyond the summary of R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin. Première partie: Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique, tome III: Les églises et les monastères*, Paris 1969, 516-517. Marco Gausoni fills a gap in the list of podestà compiled by Wolff, *A New Document*, 559-565.

28. Insert in a document drafted on 9 July 1266: A.S.P., *Archivio Diplomatico*, no. 2244.

29. A.S.V., *Sant'Andrea de Zirada*, b. 1 perg., also as insert in another document drafted in Venice on 8 February 1277: A.S.P., *Archivio Diplomatico*, no. 2705.

30. *NDCV*, no. 104. Although the contract between them refers to the Venetian parish from which their family originated, the loan in hyperpers of Constantinople clearly points to their recent arrival in Negroponte.

31. His grandfather Guglielmo, who had emigrated from Provence to Venice, obtained Venetian citizenship in 1209: Pozza, *Gli atti originali*, 42, no. 8. On the family's origin, see A. Stussi, *Provenzali a Venezia (1258-1268)*, *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, ser. III, 18 (1988) 953-954.

32. Insert in A.S.V., *Sant'Andrea de Zirada*, b. 1 perg., drafted in Venice on 19 January 1267.

33. Transaction between the two on 11 February 1262 in Negroponte: ed. by D. J. Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus and the West, 1258-1282. A Study in Byzantine-Latin Relations*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1959, 379-380, no. 2.

some Venetian settlers between 1204 and 1261, the number of those holding property and engaging in lively economic activity in Constantinople in the last decades of Latin rule must have remained fairly substantial. The Venetians were clearly the largest group among the three thousand Latins who left the city in 1261, when it reverted to Byzantine rule.³⁴

Invaluable information regarding the Venetians in Latin Constantinople appears in an undated cadaster entitled *Scripture de Sancto Achindano de Constantinopoli pertinente al patriarchado de Venexia*.³⁵ This unique document is the only one of its kind to survive for Constantinople. It lists pieces of property belonging to the patriarchate of Grado in six urban areas, three of which were situated on a narrow strip of land between the city wall and the Golden Horn and the others in their vicinity within the city itself.³⁶ Area A appears under the heading *Iste case sunt extra, iuxta murum civitatis Constantinopolitane*, and thus included houses outside the city wall yet adjoining it. Area B was located *Aput Drungarium*, or close to the Drungarius gate, while area C extended along the shore of the Golden Horn, in an area called Perama: *Iste*

The two witnesses were Giacomo and Arnaldo da Niola. The latter is already attested in Negroponte in 1240 as Rainaldus, a Latin version of his Provençal name, together with his brother Raimondo, and again in 1249: *NDCV*, no. 91 and below, n. 89, respectively.

34. For that figure, see Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, 113-114.

35. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 2; incomplete transcription marred by misreadings in Cornelius, *Ecclesiae venetae*, III, 89-90, reproduced by TTh, II, 8-11. In order to shorten the notes I shall refer in few instances only to the latter edition and correct or complete the reading of its text whenever necessary.

36. On the Venetian quarter, see H. F. Brown, The Venetians and the Venetian Quarter in Constantinople to the close of the Twelfth Century, *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 40 (1920) 74-80; Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 247-249, 291-292; Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 31-39; P. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale. Etudes sur l'évolution des structures urbaines* (Travaux et mémoires du Centre de recherche d'histoire et civilisation de Byzance, Collège de France. Monographies 9), Paris 1996, 80-81. On the Venetian churches before 1204, see also R.-J. Lilie, Die lateinische Kirche in der Romania vor dem vierten Kreuzzug, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 82 (1989) 202-206, 209-211. None of these studies locates in a satisfactory way the boundaries of the pre-1204 Venetian quarter, nor those of the enlarged one existing between 1204 and 1261.

case sunt de ripa secus mare. The first two areas were located on one side of the street called *Longario* in 1231, the third area on the other. Area D within the city wall was close to the Venetian church of St Akindynos, *Infra civitatem apud Sanctum Akyndanum*, while area E faced the latter's portal, *Ante Sanctum Akyndanum*. Area F was *Apud sanctum Johannem de Cornibus*, thus in the vicinity of a small church located between the Drungarius and Perama gates.³⁷ Finally, the cadaster mentions the balances, weights and measures belonging to the Grado patriarchate,³⁸ as well as its two quays along the Golden Horn, the *scala de Drongario* and the *scala de Perama prope scala comunis*.³⁹ In addition to these data, the cadaster provides the names of some seventy laymen, two clerics and an institution, as well as the sums collected from them as rent for the property and rights they held from the Grado patriarchate, the total amounting to some 400 hyperpers.⁴⁰

The cadaster has important implications for Venetian settlement and economic activity in Latin Constantinople and its dating, therefore, is crucial for a proper understanding of developments in these two fields. It is commonly believed that it was contemporaneous with the grant of state property made by Doge Pietro Ziani to Patriarch Benedetto Falier in February 1207, which resulted in an extension of the patriarchate's territory.⁴¹ However, a confrontation of the items listed in the cadaster with other documents excludes that dating. The podestà Giacomo Tiepolo apparently arrived in Constantinople in the autumn of 1218.⁴² In June 1220 he acknowledged having seized land belonging to the Grado pa-

37. Location of the latter in Janin, *Constantinople byzantine*, 291. Area F is explicitly mentioned in the Commune's charter of February 1207 (1206 *more veneto*) granting property to the patriarchate of Grado: TTh, II, 5. The *via de Longario* is attested in TTh, II, 284, 292.

38. On which see below, 196-197.

39. This last section of the text is incomplete in TTh, II, 11.

40. Some pieces of property appear without any reference to leaseholders, presumably because they were not rented out when the cadaster was compiled.

41. TTh, II, 4-8. The editors printed the cadaster immediately after the grant. They failed to note that the latter's date is February 1206 *more veneto* and thus February 1207. Maltezou, *Il quartiere veneziano*, 35, 41, refers more generally to the thirteenth century.

42. See Jacoby, *The Venetian Presence*, 169 and nn. 91, 93.

triarchate, on which he had begun to build a *fondaco*, a clear indication of expanding trade in Constantinople at that time and of expectations of further economic growth. On behalf of the Commune he undertook to compensate the patriarchate for the loss of revenue expected from the land by paying an annual rent of 20 hyperpers.⁴³ This payment is duly registered in area F of the cadaster: *Commune Veneciarum*, pp. xx.⁴⁴ It follows that our document has been compiled after June 1220. An even later *terminus a quo* is suggested by charters issued in 1225 and 1234. None of the individuals listed in them as tenants in areas A or B appears in the cadaster,⁴⁵ except for Judo Pino, also attested in May 1240.⁴⁶ The sources also enable us to determine a *terminus ad quem*. The cadaster was clearly drafted before April 1255, since by then several individuals registered in it as leasing property in area C were dead and had been succeeded by their heirs.⁴⁷ Other lessees attested from 1252 to 1255 do not appear at all in the cadaster or did not pay the amount of rent recorded in it.⁴⁸ In short, the cadaster must precede 1252.

43. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 23: *captum est tantum territorium* = Cornelius, *Ecclesiae venetae*, III, 99 = Maltezou, no. 36. Wolff, *A New Document*, 560, n. 1, mistakenly mentions land worth 20,000 hyperpers.

44. TTh, II, 9.

45. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, cc. 25, 26 = Maltezou, nos. 38, 39, and *DCV*, no. 691.

46. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 30 = Maltezou, no. 43.

47. Stefano da Tumba held three pieces of land in area C and his heirs owned a house in that same area in April 1255: TTh, II, 493-495. The Greek Basilios Sulimanus held there two pieces of land, while in September 1253 as well as in March and April 1255 Demetrius Sulimanus, called 'the Monemvasiote' in the last instance, in all likelihood his heir, also held a house in area C: *ibid.*, 492-495. For the localization of *super saro* (strangely written *stano* in this document), see Maltezou, *Il quartiere veneziano*, 37-38.

48. For 1252, 1253 and 1255: A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 33 = Maltezou, no. 47; TTh, II, 492-495. On 12 December 1253 Vitale Venier paid 9 hyperpers for six months rent to the podestà Antonio Soranzo, which does not correspond with his annual payment of 10 hyperpers registered in area A of the cadaster: A.S.V., *Cancellaria inferiore, Notai*, b. 8, no. 19. Vitale Ferro is recorded in that same area, while the house of Giovanni Ferro, apparently his son, is attested in area A in 1255: TTh, II, 495-496. *Super stano* in this document is clearly a notary's slip for *saro*. The correction *Steno* suggested by the editors is to be rejected, since Stenon was the name of the Bosphorus. For the localization of the *sarum*, see above, n. 47.

A document dealing with the leases and property of Raimondo Bello enables a more precise dating of the cadaster between 1220 or 1234 on the one hand, and 1252 on the other. In 1225 Raimondo Bello owned a workshop (*ergasterium*) in area A.⁴⁹ By the time of his death, presumably within the first months of 1240, he had accumulated many pieces of land as well as buildings in Constantinople and had become wealthy. The podestà Giovanni Michiel ordered the transfer of the land he held and the buildings he owned to his widow Rosa, obviously in response to the latter's request. Since the land was partly located in areas A and C, the move entailed the Commune's usurpation of the patriarchate's rights and the loss of some of the latter's territory. It prompted Giberto Querini, in his capacity as the patriarchate's agent, to contest the transfer on 30 April 1240, in all likelihood shortly after it had taken place.⁵⁰ All these events must have occurred in rapid succession. Since Raimondo Bello is not registered in the cadaster, we may safely date the latter after the usurpation. Nor does the widow Rosa Bello appear in our document, which implies that Giberto Querini had not yet obtained restitution of the patriarchate's land when it was drafted.

The dating of the cadaster after 30 April 1240 is strongly supported by additional evidence. We have already noted that among those mentioned in the documents of 1225 and 1234 only Jubo Pino is attested later, in May 1240.⁵¹ In addition, the names of several lessees, the location of the property they held and the rents they paid according to the cadaster conform with the relevant data included in various contracts of 1240. Such is the case of Andrea Donà, who in March of that year obtained land in area D, in the vicinity of St Akindynos, for one hyperper annually.⁵² The

49. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 24 = Maltezou, no. 37.

50. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 29 = Maltezou, no. 42. It is unclear why Giberto Querini also contested the transfer of Bello's assets standing on other land, including that of the Commune. The podestà Giovanni Michiel was in office between 6 March 1240 and 6 March 1241, a period in which he fought a naval battle: see Wolff, *A New Document*, 563 and n. 2.

51. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 30 = Maltezou, no. 43.

52. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 28 = Maltezou, no. 41; according to the cadaster, he held an additional piece in that same area for two hyperpers.

same holds true of Giorgio Signolo, who held land in area C for an annual payment of 12 hyperpers, is attested there on 30 April 1240, and renewed his lease in February 1241 in return for the same amount.⁵³ The Greek Georgius the Monemvasiote paid in May 1240 three yearly installments totalling 21 hyperpers for land in area B, in accordance with the cadaster's listing of a yearly rent of 7 hyperpers.⁵⁴ In September Berardo Firmano promised 4 hyperpers for land in area C, as recorded in our document.⁵⁵ Giovanni da Tumba is listed in area C for 6 and Pasquale Bollani for 12 hyperpers, both being attested there in February 1241.⁵⁶ The latter renewed his lease in September 1253 and had it confirmed in March 1255 for half the previous sum, a reduction he may have obtained at that occasion.⁵⁷

Two more lessees recorded in our document are attested as residents of Constantinople around April 1240, the suggested *terminus a quo* for its drafting. Nicolò Querini, who served as councillor to the podestà in 1207, was presumably identical with the individual who on 4 September 1238 provided 13,134 hyperpers for the consolidation of a number of loans previously advanced to the leading barons governing the Latin Empire.⁵⁸ Emperor Baldwin II was then travelling in the West in a quest for aid. As surety Nicolò Querini received the Crown of Thorns supposedly worn by Christ, which until he would be reimbursed was to be kept in the Commune's treasury located in the monastery of the Pantokrator.⁵⁹

53. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, cc. 29, 27 = Maltezos, nos. 42, 45. He is also attested in 1251, in connection with the summoning of Marco Venier to appear in court: see above, n. 25.

54. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 30 = Maltezos, no. 43.

55. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 31 = Maltezos, no. 44. Neighbors Donato Pietro and Giacomo Nanni also appear in the cadaster.

56. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 27 = Maltezos, no. 45. Giovanni da Tumba served as *iudex* in 1243 when he confirmed a will drafted in Negroponte in May 1241: *NDCV*, no. 92.

57. TTh, II, 492-493.

58. For 1207, see TTh, I, 558.

59. TTh, II, 346-349, better ed. in A. Teulet (ed.), *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, II, Paris 1866, 391-392, no. 2744. On the Pantokrator, see above, n. 27. There was no factor common to the previous creditors, who must have acted separately: see below, 197-199.

Nicolò is registered in the cadaster in area D.⁶⁰ The *plebanus* Giacomo Viviano, recorded in area E, was presumably identical with the priest listed without name in area C. In May 1241 he is mentioned by name in the will of a Venetian resident of Constantinople, Biagio Gisberto, as *plebanus qui moratur in Constantinopoli*.⁶¹ By that time Giacomo Viviano was certainly well known among the Venetian residents of the city, where he had been acting as notary for many years.⁶² Moreover, he worked for Giberto Querini, who served as agent for the Patriarch of Grado since June 1239 at the latest.⁶³ Three leases he drafted at the request of Giberto Querini between September 1240 and January 1242 have survived.⁶⁴ There is good reason to believe that both were involved in the drafting of additional leases, as well as in the updating of the list of property and rights belonging to the Grado patriarchate and the revenue these yielded.

The need for a periodic updating was obvious. The patriarchate's land and houses were generally rented out under long-term contracts for 29 years, yet occasionally changed hands even within such periods, whether as a result of the tenant's death or of a transfer.⁶⁵ On the other hand, quays appear to have been leased on a yearly basis, like the Perama quay granted in January 1242 to Vitale Bugari for one year only in return for 15 hyperpers.⁶⁶

60. Instead *Christi*, as in the edited of TTh, II, 10, read *Querini*. He should not be confused with a namesake, Nicolò son of Giberto Querini, who was emancipated by his father some years later, in 1242, and could not hold property in his own name until then: see above, 184.

61. *NDCV*, no. 92 (p. 106). Sometime earlier he had deposited with Biagio Gisberto an icon as collateral for a loan of 5 hyperpers and 11 carats.

62. He was already in Constantinople by February 1228, when he drafted two contracts regarding land rented out by the monastery of S. Tommaso di Torcello: A.S.V., *Madonna dell'Orto*, b. 1 perg. He signed them as *plebanus sancti Johannis Decollati*, a church in Venice. In later documents he upheld his ecclesiastical title while omitting the name of the church.

63. See Jacoby, *The Venetian Presence*, 185, and above, n. 12.

64. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 27, 31, 32 = Maltezos, nos. 44-46.

65. Note the updating in area F: *Due casete Dom. Patriarche, modo est* [sic] *Otonis Spadario, deva* [sic] *kar. XII, modo est de Otone Spadario*. *Modo* means 'now'.

66. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 32 = Maltezos, no. 46.

Further evidence for such a yearly lease comes from the cadaster, which for the same quay records a rent of 16 hyperpers, different from the one attested in 1242.⁶⁷ The usurpation of land belonging to the Grado patriarchate by the podestà shortly before 30 April 1240 must have seriously alarmed Giberto Querini. It presumably prompted him to entrust Giacomo Viviano with the drafting of an updated cadaster, which he intended to send together with other documents to his brother Patriarch Leonardo Querini in order to enable the latter to seek redress from the doge. In all likelihood, then, the cadaster was compiled shortly after 30 April 1240. Its drafting must have preceded January 1242, since as just noted the one-year rent Vitale Bugari promised to pay then differed from the amount stated in the cadaster.⁶⁸ In short, this document may be safely ascribed to the months following April 1240 or to the year 1241. Its extant text is clearly not the original version, as revealed by the absence of a date, but a copy presumably made in Venice rather than in Constantinople. The Italian heading mentioned above appears to be a later addition. It suggests that the Grado patriarchate kept documents recording its property and rights in the church of St Akindynos, included in its section of Constantinople since 1107.⁶⁹

The nature and uses of the property listed in the Grado cadaster and other documents and the rents paid for them varied widely. A few cases only will be adduced here to illustrate this point. Otto Spadario paid 12 carats or half of one hyperper only for two huts (*due casete*) in area F, the use of which is unclear.⁷⁰ Pietro Barberio lived in a small house (*domuncula in qua manet*) in area C, for which he owed 1 1/2 hyperper. Leonardo Brissano and Olurado Trevisano jointly held for 2 hyperpers per year a house topped by a tower in area B, in which they presumably resided.

67. The identity of the quay mentioned in both instances will be discussed elsewhere.

68. See above, n. 66.

69. Grant of that year in TTh, I, 67-74. On the administrative function of this church in the twelfth-century Venetian quarter, see Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, 571, and below. On its particular ecclesiastical status, see Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio*, 38.

70. See above, n. 65.

They also rented vacant land in area D.⁷¹ All these leaseholders appear to have been of rather modest economic standing. By contrast, others were clearly affluent. We have already noted that Pasquale Bollani owed an annual rent of 12 hyperpers, the highest amount registered in the cadaster, for property in area C adjoining the *scala maior* along the Golden Horn.⁷² He also paid 72 hyperpers for the lease of the patriarchate's balances, weights and measures, kept in the church of St Akindynos, clearly expecting larger revenues from their use.⁷³ Interestingly, sometime after April 1240 Giorgio Signolo also paid 12 hyperpers per year for land in area C, according to the cadaster. When Giberto Querini renewed his lease in February 1241 he granted him the right to exercise money-changing on the land he held, though Signolo still had to obtain the Commune's authorization to this effect.⁷⁴ Similar clauses seldom appear in Venetian leases drafted in Constantinople.⁷⁵ We may conclude, therefore, that like Pasquale Bollani, mentioned earlier, Signolo expected good profits in the near future. He must have reached this positive assessment in a context of lively commercial activity in the Venetian quarter in 1240.

Additional affluent individuals are listed in the Grado cadaster of 1240-1241. One should remember, though, that despite its importance this document offers only a partial view of Venetian settlement and landholding in Constantinople around that time. Venetian ecclesiastical institutions other than the Grado patriarchate

71. Only their first names are registered in this section of the cadaster.

72. See above, n. 56. He possibly resided in the house he held in that area.

73. TTh, II, 11. In 1107 the Commune granted the Grado patriarchate a monopoly on their use within the entire Venetian quarter: TTh, I, 68. In 1169 the latter leased them for six years to Romano Mairano: *DCV*, no. 245.

74. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 27 = Maltezou, no. 45. Signolo promised to pay the same yearly amount, even *si dominus potestas Constantinopolis aut Comune Venecie non permetteret me tabulas de incambio ut dictum est tenere*. Another case illustrating the Commune's authority in this field within the entire Venetian quarter, regardless of the land's owner, is provided by testimonies recorded on 7 June 1260: A.S.V., *Procuratori di S. Marco de Supra*, b. 135, proc. 287, fasc. 2.

75. A case in 1206, when Benedetto de Salmaza planned to engage in money-changing on the *scala maior* within that same area: TTh, II, 43-45.

chate also owned land in the city, while the Commune retained some territory directly under its own authority. It is not always possible, therefore, to determine whether the lessees of the Grado patriarchate resided on the latter's land or elsewhere in Constantinople. Such is the case of Giovanni Bon, son of Marco the weigher (*pesator*), who in April 1240 owned buildings both between the city's wall and the Golden Horn and within the city itself, some standing in area A of the patriarchate's property and others on the Commune's land (*super territorium comunis Venecie*).⁷⁶ At the time of his death somewhat earlier Raimondo Bello owned wooden and stone structures on these same territories as well as on that of S. Marco dell'Embolo. He resided in a large mansion (*palatium*) flanked by a garden, a courtyard and a vineyard, all apparently located in the latter section of the city.⁷⁷ The wealthy Nicolò Querini, who in 1238 obtained the Crown of Thorns as collateral for the substantial loan of 13,134 hyperpers,⁷⁸ must have also lived in a stately residence, clearly not on the land in area D of the Grado patriarchate for which he owed an annual rent of one pound of candles only.⁷⁹ Incidentally, this payment is the smallest one mentioned in the cadaster. It appears to have been merely symbolic and raises some questions about the criteria used for the calculation of rents.

Two affluent Venetians living in Constantinople yet not re-

76. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 29 = Maltezou, no. 42. The location in area A, also recorded in the cadaster, is confirmed by the reference to the *sarum maius* next to the land held by Angelo Correr in 1225: A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 24 = Maltezou, no. 37. On the *sarum*, see above, n. 47. Since the name Giovanni Bon must have been quite common, the name and function of his father were mentioned in order to distinguish the former from contemporary namesakes in Latin Constantinople. Two earlier ones are attested: a former resident of Rodosto in 1206: TTh, II, 43-45, and A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 13 = Maltezou, no. 23; another acting in 1206 and 1207 as agent for the Grado patriarchate: *ibid.* and TTh, II, 52-54. Maltezou, II quartiere veneziano, 58, fails to distinguish between the three in her index.

77. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 29 = Maltezou, no. 42.

78. See above, 193.

79. This regular rent differed from the payment of two pounds of candles mentioned in a lease of 1240, in connection with the latter's renewal after 29 years: A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 31 = Maltezou, no. 44.

corded in the cadaster appear among the creditors reimbursed with the money provided by Nicolò Querini in 1238. One of them was Nicolò Corner, who with Biagio Gisberto, another resident of Constantinople, shared in May 1241 the ownership of a *sandalum*, a small vessel.⁸⁰ Together with Pietro Zane, not known from other sources, Nicolò Corner was repaid 2,200 hyperpers. The podestà Albertino Morosini, acting on behalf of the Commune, received 4,175 hyperpers, and the abbess of the richly endowed Cistercian monastery of *Perceul* in Constantinople, 4,300 hyperpers.⁸¹ This last sum is particularly impressive since it derived from the monastery's revenues. The remaining 2,459 hyperpers were owed to Genoese merchants, whose presence in Constantinople deserves particular attention. Venice's strong position in the city since 1204 and its ongoing rivalry with Genoa had induced Genoese merchants to avoid trading there. Despite four agreements concluded between the two maritime powers from 1218 to 1251, there was no renewal of Genoese official presence in Constantinople until after the Byzantine reconquest of 1261.⁸² On the other hand, Genoese merchants were again active in the city since the treaty of 1232. It is noteworthy that together with the Venetians and the Pisans they participated in the defence of Constantinople in 1236, apparently in numbers large enough to make a meaningful contribution recorded by a western chronicler.⁸³ It is impossible to determine, however, whether there were any Genoese settlers among them. In any event, it is against this background that some Genoese mer-

80. According to the latter's will: *NDCV*, no. 92 (p. 106).

81. On this monastery, see E. A. R. Brown, *The Cistercians in the Latin Empire of Constantinople and Greece, 1201-1276*, *Traditio* 24 (1958) 91-93.

* Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique*, 581-582, locates it in the area of Petrion. All the debts resulting from loans included interest, unless stated otherwise as below, n. 89.

82. On these treaties, see S. Origone, *Die Verträge der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts zwischen Genua und Venedig*, *Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich* 8 (1986) 89-95, esp. 92, who rightly stresses that all the clauses referring to a Genoese official presence in Constantinople were formulated in the future tense and that their repetition implies that they were never implemented.

83. [F.] de Reiffenberg (ed.), *Chronique rimée de Philippe Mouskes* (Collection de chroniques belges inédites), Bruxelles 1838, II, 620, vv. 29, 236-49, 243.

chants loaned money to Baldwin II in or shortly before 1238. While improved political conditions offered them an incentive to visit Constantinople, only a lively economic context and good prospects of profit would have induced them to engage in trading and money-lending in the city over several years after 1232.⁸⁴

The same picture emerges from the credit operations of some residents of Latin Constantinople in the following decades. According to the cadaster Nicolò and Giovanni Scotto paid 7 and 5 hyperpers respectively for land in area A in 1240-1241. In March 1257 their relative Andrea Scotto obtained from the abbot of the monastery of S. Tommaso dei Borgognoni di Torcello two pieces of land in the *ruga Allemanorum*, to the east of the ancient Venetian quarter, for 2 hyperpers per year.⁸⁵ The three individuals owed rather modest rents. One of them must have been identical with a resident of Constantinople called Escot 'the Tuscan', whose first name is not recorded.⁸⁶ Empress Mary of Brienne owed him 550 livres tournois or about 880 hyperpers for a loan made before her departure for the West, which presumably took place in or shortly after October 1248.⁸⁷ There is good reason to believe that the three

84. On a Genoese who apparently died there in 1250, see M. Balard, *Les Génois en Romanie entre 1204 et 1261. Recherches sur les minutiers notariaux génois, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, publiés par l'Ecole Française de Rome* 78 (1966) 484, repr. in Id., *La mer Noire et la Romanie génoise (XIIIe-XVe siècles)*, London 1989, no. I. The owners of a ship sailing from Genoa in the spring of 1254, thus after the renewal of the peace treaty between Genoa and Venice in 1251 (see above, n. 82), mentioned Constantinople as a possible destination: ed. by E. H. Byrne, *Genoese Shipping in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Century*, Cambridge, Mass. 1930, 125-128, no. XXXVII.

85. A.S.V., *S. Tommaso dei Borgogno ni di Torcello in Madonna dell'Orto*, b. 1 perg., Rialto, 25 July 1258. Magdalino, *Constantinople médiévale*, 80, 89, locates the area to the west of the quarter, yet see above, n. 16.

86. Escot was the French version of Italian Scotto. Bonencontre Escot appears among Sienese merchants involved in June 1251 in a loan to King Louis IX of France, who was then camping next to crusader Caesarea: J. de Laborde (ed.), *Layettes du Trésor des Chartes*, III, Paris 1875, 135, no. 3948.

87. Mary of Brienne wrote on 30 January 1249 from Negroponte to Queen Blanche of France, requesting her to reimburse the loan: *ibid.*, III, 54, no. 3737. Negroponte is not mentioned in this letter, yet in others sent around the same time: see below, n. 89. For the dating of Mary's departure, see below, n. 92. For the exchange rate between the two currencies at that time,

individuals bearing the surname Scotto belonged to the Sienese mercantile and banking company of the Scotti served as and its permanent representatives in Constantinople or, in any event, conducted business in close association with it.⁸⁸ Mary was also indebted for 680 livres tournois or about 1,088 hyperpers to Bon de Monz, another 'Tuscan' living in Constantinople who, however, is not directly attested by other sources bearing on that city.⁸⁹ He too may have belonged to a mercantile and banking company. The two creditors were together with Mary of Brienne in Negroponte at the end of January 1249 and later travelled to Paris, where they were reimbursed in May 1249.⁹⁰ Their journey must have been connected with business at the fairs of Champagne, which were at-

see R. L. Wolff, Mortgage and Redemption of an Emperor's son: Castile and the Latin Empire of Constantinople, *Speculum* 29 (1954) 53, repr. in idem, *Studies in the Latin Empire*, no. V.

88. On the Scotti of Siena, not among the prominent companies of that city, see E. D. English, *Enterprise and Liability in Sienese Banking, 1230-1350*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1988, 16, 35, 46. On their activity in the crusader Levant, see D. Jacoby, Migration, Trade and Banking in Crusader Acre, in L. Mavromatis (ed.), *The Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean*, Athens 1998, nn. 46-49 (in press). A Scotto company also existed in Piacenza: see P. Racine in P. Castignoli - M. A. Romanini (eds.), *Storia di Piacenza, II, Dal vescovo conte alla signoria (996-1313)*, Piacenza 1984, 198, 221-222, 301-346. A Scotto is documented in the Frankish Principality of Morea in the 1270s: see D. Jacoby, Italian Migration and Settlement in Latin Greece: the Impact on the Economy, in H. E. Mayer (ed.), *Einwanderer und Minderheiten. Die Kreuzfahrerstaaten als Multikulturelle Gesellschaft* (Schriften des Historischen Kollegs, Kolloquien Band 37), München 1997, 112. On the business pattern of Italians operating on behalf of companies or on their own in thirteenth-century Latin Greece, see *ibid.*, 107-113.

89. De Laborde, *Layettes*, III, 55, no. 1741, letter of Mary of Brienne to Queen Blanche of France written in Negroponte on 31 January 1249. The French name stands for Italian Buondelmonte, presumably a surname like Escot. It is impossible to determine wherefrom he came. The Florentine Buondelmonte family is not known to have engaged in banking. In Negroponte Mary of Brienne also received in February 1249 a loan of 1,800 livres tournois, yet *sanz usure et sanz nul preu*, from Ernaut de Nioles, whose name is the French version of Arnaldo da Niola: *ibid.*, III, 56, no. 3745. On the latter, see also above, n. 33.

90. See above, n. 87 and 89, and receipts in De Laborde, *Layettes*, III, nos. 3773 and 3774 respectively.

tended by numerous merchants operating on behalf of Sienese and other Italian companies.⁹¹ The latter's presence in Latin Constantinople, not noted until now, reveals yet another facet of their activity around the eastern Mediterranean in the thirteenth century.

By October 1248 Emperor Baldwin II personally owed an unspecified number of merchants in Constantinople a total of 24,000 hyperpers, which he empowered his wife Mary of Brienne to reimburse in the West.⁹² It is generally believed that this sum was due for money loaned by the brothers Angelo and Giovanni Ferro, members of a Venetian family who were established in Constantinople, and that in return for this sum the emperor had mortgaged to them his son Philip of Courtenay, who was kept on their behalf in Venice.⁹³ However, there is good reason to believe that the debt of 24,000 hyperpers and the one to the brothers Ferro were separate issues. Some weighty arguments have been raised against the connection between the two,⁹⁴ to which others may be added. Indeed, when mentioning the former debt Baldwin II appears to refer to separate loans obtained from several merchants, and not just to one loan.⁹⁵ Moreover, since he mentions a specific sum, the latter must have included interest for a well-defined period, whereas the mortgaging of Philip and his transfer to Venice imply that Baldwin II could not determine in advance when he would reimburse the loan. These arguments are backed by the fact that, contrary to what one would expect, the letter Baldwin II issued to his wife in 1248 does not make the slightest reference to the freeing of their son Philip. Finally, it is highly unlikely that the Ferro brothers should have agreed that the large sum they had loaned the emperor should have remained immobilized for twelve

91. On the Sienese at the fairs, see the overview by M. Tangheroni, *Siena e il commercio internazionale nel Duecento e nel Trecento*, in idem, *Medioevo Tirrenico. Sardegna, Toscana e Pisa*, Pisa 1992, 142-151.

92. De Laborde, *Layettes*, III, 50, no. 3727: *cum nous aions emprunté de marcheanz*. The emperor's letter was issued shortly before Mary's departure.

93. Wolff, *Mortgage and Redemption*, 45-82.

94. B. Hendrickx, *Regestes des empereurs latins de Constantinople (1204-1261/1272)*, *Byzantina* 14 (1988) 161-165, no. 261, suggests a larger sum and a later dating. [This study has also been published separately].

95. Note the plural in the reference to the creditors, above, n. 92.

years or more, since sometime before October 1248 until early 1261,⁹⁶ unless they had been offered substantial compensations. It follows that their loan must have been made closer to that year.

Vitale Ferro, father of the two brothers, served in June 1220 as councillor to the Venetian podestà of Constantinople.⁹⁷ In the Grado cadaster he is recorded for land in area C, which Giovanni Ferro apparently held in 1255.⁹⁸ In June 1259 Giovanni and Angelo were on business in Venice and involved in the transfer of money for the upkeep of Philip of Courtenay.⁹⁹ In all likelihood they loaned a substantial sum, the amount of which is unknown, to Baldwin II a few years before 8 January 1258, when Philip is first attested in Venice.¹⁰⁰ After staying there for some time the brothers Ferro presumably returned to Constantinople and were among those who fled the city at the time of the Byzantine reconquest of 1261. In Venice Giovanni later served in prestigious state offices, which clearly point to his high social standing. He was one of the *iudices examinatum* in 1265 and 1267 and member of the *Minor Consiglio* assisting Doge Lorenzo Tiepolo in 1268-1269.¹⁰¹ As such he was involved in the negotiations leading to the Venetian-Byzantine agreement of 30 June 1268.¹⁰² The experience he had gathered over the years in Constantinople must have been of great value in this framework.

The information offered by the Grado cadaster, its new dating to 1240-1241 and its confrontation with other sources warrant several observations. First, it is clear by now that Venetian as well as foreign merchants and bankers resided in Latin Constantinople for long periods of time, some being succeeded by their sons. Several of them mustered substantial resources and conducted

96. As suggested by Wolff, *Mortgage and Redemption*, esp. 52-56.

97. A.S.V., *MP*, b. 9, c. 23 = Cornelius, *Ecclesiae venetae*, III, 99 = Malte-zou, no. 36. He is further attested in Constantinople in 1223: TTh, II, 253-254.

98. TTh, II, 495-496.

99. According to two documents edited by Wolff, *Mortgage and Redemption*, 48-49.

100. Testimony in a letter of King Louis IX of France: *ibid.*, 49.

101. See Röscher, *Der venezianische Adel*, 211, 220.

102. TTh, III, 100, 101 = new ed. by M. Pozza e G. Ravegnani, *I trattati con Bisanzio, 1265-1285* (Pacta veneta, 6), Venezia 1996, 64, 66.

large-scale profitable business, including in the last three decades of Latin rule until the Byzantine reconquest of 1261. It is noteworthy, however, that even with respect to the best known cases, those of the Venetian Nicolò Querini in 1238, the Sienese Scotti in the 1240s, Nicolò son of Giberto Querini and the Ferro brothers in the 1250s, we are offered no more than a glimpse of their economic activity and especially of their involvement in trade. This should remind us once more of the fragmentary nature of our documentation. Precisely for that same reason extreme caution must be exercised when dealing with rents and sale prices of real estate. These do not appear to have been lower in the Latin period than in the twelfth century. Moreover, in both periods they seem to have been sometimes determined by considerations other than the straight value of the property concerned.¹⁰³ Some unpublished documents strongly support this interpretation, and the whole issue requires a renewed examination of all the relevant evidence. Finally, several examples adduced above reveal that the available real estate values do not faithfully reflect the economic standing and activity of their tenants or owners, nor do they allow any clear-cut conclusions about the state of the city's economy in the Latin period.

The implications of credit should be briefly addressed in this context. Regardless of whether it was intended for economic ventures, conspicuous consumption or diplomatic and military purposes, credit was closely linked in various ways to trade and shipping. These were the main sources of the funds accumulated by wealthy residents of Constantinople engaging in large-scale credit operations.¹⁰⁴ These were also the economic branches involved in the import of capital since, as in the West, individual merchants and bankers as well as companies generally preferred transfers from one place to another in the form of goods rather than in cash or pullion. In any event, even if not sustained continuously to * the same degree, the influx of cash and the latter's diffusion in Latin Constantinople were bound to stimulate to some extent

103. As, for example, the rent consisting of one pound of candles paid by Nicolò Querini: see above, n. 79.

104. The renting out of dwellings and workshops provided additional income.

various economic sectors. This is not to say that the credit operations documented above point to a thriving economy. To be sure, the worsening political, territorial and financial condition of the Latin Empire, practically reduced to Constantinople in the last three decades of its existence, may have affected the urban economy, although perhaps not as much as one would expect. In fact, weighty evidence suggests a growth in trading in the city in the 1240s and 1250s.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, one should not consider the debts incurred by Venice for the defence of Constantinople as reflecting the state of the latter's economy, since state loans in particular circumstances were common Venetian practice even in cities enjoying intense economic activity such as crusader Acre.¹⁰⁶ More importantly, it is essential to distinguish between the condition of Latin Empire or that of Constantinople on the one hand, and the economic activity and standing of the *individuals* residing in the city, on the other. In conditions similar to those of the Latin Empire after the 1220s, late Byzantium, limited to its capital except for its province in the Peloponnese, experienced a sharp political and financial decline, while at the same time some of its citizens were accumulating considerable wealth.¹⁰⁷ In sum, then, to put it simply, it may well be that a fair number of Venetians settled in the city between 1204 and 1261 were rich rather than poor.

105. For its investigation, see above, n. 1.

106. On 4 December 1259 Doge Ranieri Zeno empowered the podestà Marco Gradenigo to raise 3,000 hyperpers: TTh, III, 24-26. The date appears in the Italian summary of a document of 5 August 1260 dealing with Giovanni Gausoni, who contributed 200 hyperpers to that loan: ed. by Geanakoplos, *Emperor Michael Palaeologus*, 378-379, no. 1. A note by a later hand in the manuscript containing the doge's authorization mentions an additional loan of 4,000 hyperpers, presumably ordered in 1260 or 1261 yet not documented otherwise: TTh, III, 24. On state loans in Acre, see R. Cessi (ed.), *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia*, Bologna 1931-1950, III, 4, par. 8, with reference to the period preceding 1282.

107. See Angeliki E. Laiou-Thomadakis, *The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System; Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries*, *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 34/35 (1982) 188, 204-205, 222.

VIII

From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change

The Fourth Crusade ended in April 1204 with the western or Latin conquest of Constantinople and signalled the beginning of a new era in the history of the Byzantine lands or Romania. Extensive areas of the empire were conquered by western or Latin armies during and shortly after the crusade. Some of these territories were recovered by Byzantium, while others remained for two centuries or more under Latin rule. Such was the case with Attica and Boeotia, most of the Peloponnese or the Morea, as well as Crete, Euboea, and numerous other islands of the Aegean. It is in these areas that the transition from Byzantine to Latin rule and some of its repercussions will be examined, though evidence bearing on other parts of Latin Romania will also be adduced when necessary.¹

Military conquest and political upheaval have always attracted the attention of contemporaries, chroniclers sometimes recording these fateful events in minute detail. On the other hand, they were little interested, if at all, in the less conspicuous, almost subterranean flow of daily life expressed in the survival of social structures, legal and administrative institutions, or economic patterns and practices. In the idiom of the modern mass media, continuity never made headlines. It should be noted, however, that once the savagery of battle had subsided, conquerors who intended to settle in their newly acquired lands adopted a pragmatic approach. Irrespective of the new regime they introduced in these lands, they had to deal with some urgent practical matters such as the division of spoils, especially of real estate, and how to ensure their daily livelihood. Their physical survival as individuals and their collective superiority acquired by conquest were at stake. Their first concern, therefore, was to find ways to tap the resources of their new lands and ensure a smooth flow of revenue to their treasuries. In order to succeed in this endeavour, they had to rely on the administrative and fiscal institutions and practices of the past. In this respect continuity was a matter of both necessity and convenience.

All these features appear in Latin Romania after the Fourth Crusade. Yet the Latin occupation implied a complex and much wider encounter between Latins and Byzantine populations, with their

respective social structure, institutions, legal and religious traditions, culture and mentality. In order to gauge the effects of the Latin conquest, therefore, we have to determine, as far as possible, the balance between continuity and change in each of these spheres. To be more precise, it is essential to detect the factors that account for varying degrees of continuity in some of them, change and accommodation in others, and a break elsewhere. Unfortunately, the evidence at our disposal is fragmentary and unevenly distributed both in time and space. It is impossible, therefore, to shed light to the same extent on all the aspects of transition from Byzantine to Latin rule.

The most striking and abrupt deviation from the Byzantine past generated by the Latin conquest was of a political nature. To be sure, the empire had begun to disintegrate in the years immediately preceding the Fourth Crusade,² yet this process was hastened and intensified by the Latin conquest. By 1210 Romania – Latin Romania in particular – was fragmented into numerous political and territorial entities. The impact of the conquest differed from one territory to another. The spheres, nature, and degree of both continuity and change in each of them largely depended on the combination of three factors: the existence of local or regional features prior to the Latin occupation; the conditions in which the conquest took place; and, finally, the political and social impact of the various groups of conquerors on their respective territories. As we shall see, the initial phase of Latin occupation determined to a large extent the specific long-term development of each of these territories.

Let us now briefly consider the three factors just mentioned. Largely seen through the prisma of imperial documentation, the Byzantine empire before 1204 appears to have been more or less uniform in character, in numerous spheres, while in others there was diversity: the existence of specific local or regional features in the twelfth-century empire is illustrated by later sources, to which we shall return in due course. As for the conditions in which the conquest occurred, one may point, for instance, to important differences between the Peloponnese and Crete. In the Peloponnese the Latins progressively occupied one area after the other, mostly after reaching accommodation with their respective leaders and only seldom encountering armed resistance. By contrast Crete was conquered by force within a short period and maintained under Venetian rule with the help of military might. The specific encounter between Latins and indigenous population in each of these two territories goes far to explain their diverging social evolution in later years.³ The most important factor in this respect, however, was the composition and character of the

conquering elites, the political organization and social structure they established in conquered territories, and the particular conception of authority underlying their institutions. The Peloponnese – save for Venetian Messenia – as well as Attica, Boeotia, and Negroponte, were conquered and subsequently ruled by knights who imposed a feudal superstructure on Byzantine society. The importation of western feudalism implied a marked departure from Byzantine tradition, as it involved the disappearance of the state and the transfer of its authority and prerogatives to private hands. Privatization was one of the most fundamental expressions of the process of feudalization, and had important, long-lasting social implications, to which we shall later return.⁴ In many Aegean islands the Italian lords instituted what may be called a pseudo-feudal regime: they used feudal terminology and applied rules of feudal law imported from the Morea, which somewhat changed the social stratification of the indigenous population, yet averted the privatization of Byzantine state rights.⁵

By contrast, in Crete and a section of southern Messenia around Coron and Modon there was an almost direct transition from the empire's rule to that of Venice, a city governed by a non-feudal elite imbued with a firm sense of statehood. In these Venetian territories, therefore, the measure of continuity was likely to be much greater than in feudalized areas. Indeed, although using the feudal vocabulary, Venice upheld the supreme authority of the state and prevented any definitive privatization of Byzantine imperial prerogatives in judicial or fiscal matters. Venice also inherited state lands, their peasantry, as well as state prerogatives, and established a highly centralized bureaucratic system of government and supervision.⁶ In sum, it is obvious that whatever the regime established by the conquering leaders in their respective territories, the indigenous societies were affected by their submission to Latin rule. Social mobility in their midst was no more governed by the social and institutional forces at play in the empire; it was arrested by the conquest and henceforth largely depended upon Latin acquiescence.

Around 1200, at the time of the conquest, the differences between Byzantine and western societies were rather striking.⁷ In Byzantine society all free men enjoyed equal legal status and were justiciable in imperial courts according to the same Byzantine law, regardless of their social and economic standing or the imperial privileges they held. Such was also the case with members of the social elite. Byzantine society thus lacked formal legal stratification. In the western provinces, as elsewhere in the empire, the social elite included rich landlords, imperial officials, and imperial dignitaries, all known as *archontes*. Occasionally the great landlords enhanced their prestige and social

ascendancy by acquiring governmental functions or honorary titles in the imperial hierarchy. Some *archontes* developed in their own interest a network of personal bonds, yet these always retained their private nature and were never recognized by law or sanctioned by custom. These bonds were thus basically different from western vassalage. The chiefs of Slav groups settled in the Peloponnese, such as the Melings of Mount Taygetus, were also considered *archontes* after receiving imperial titles that strengthened their traditional authority and status. In the western provinces the breakdown of imperial supervision shortly before 1204 enabled some *archontes* to usurp imperial land and exercise state prerogatives in military, fiscal, and judicial matters. The Latin conquest deprived them of these short-lived benefits.

Somewhat exceptional in Byzantine society and law was the status of the *paroikos* or dependent peasant. Paradoxically he was considered free, though subject to some important personal restrictions and tied to the state or to his lord by links of dependence of a legal nature.⁸ Yet this did not imply the existence in the empire of an overall rigid social and legal stratification, such as found in the feudal West in the same period. Nor did the imperial grant of a *paroikos* to an individual or an ecclesiastical institution involve a definitive alienation of state prerogatives or the replacement of imperial by private jurisdiction.

The issue of state prerogative around 1200 requires some elaboration with regard to the *pronoia*. The *pronoia* was an imperial concession of fiscal revenues to an individual, often in return for military service. The peasants from whom the holder of the *pronoia* collected these revenues and the imperial land they cultivated were generally transferred to the grantee for his lifetime. It has been claimed that the *pronoia* was similar to the western fief; moreover, that it was the basis of the Byzantine military system and constituted a major factor in the so-called feudalization of the empire, which allegedly led to its downfall; finally that the similarity between *pronoia* and fief supposedly explains the easy adaptation of the conquering Latin knights to local Byzantine conditions. However, neither Byzantine and Latin sources around the time of the conquest, nor later sources yield a single conclusive piece of evidence about the *pronoia* or about *pronoia* holders in the conquered territories we are dealing with. Several factors may explain the absence of such evidence. The paucity of Byzantine sources bearing in this area should be taken into account; the diffusion of the *pronoia* in the western provinces may have been more limited than elsewhere in the empire; or the *pronoia* existing before 1204 may have been assimilated to patrimonial estates and registered as such when imperial supervision collapsed shortly before 1204. Whatever the case, in this period the *pronoia* was definitely not the dominant form of

landed property in the empire, nor the backbone of its military forces. It was basically a fiscal grant and did not entail the transfer of imperial prerogatives such as taxation and jurisdiction to individuals. Moreover, fundamental differences existed between the Byzantine *pronoia* and the western fief with regard to inheritance, the exercise of jurisdiction, as well as social, political, and military functions within Byzantium and western Europe, respectively. In short, the use of 'feudalization' in the Byzantine context, whether or not in connection with the *pronoia*, appears to be inappropriate, is misleading and may therefore be safely rejected.⁹

In contrast to Byzantine society, society in the areas of the West from which the conquerors originated was highly stratified around 1200. With the exception of the major Italian cities, including Venice, there was a clear-cut distinction between noblemen, burgesses, and dependent peasants. Each class was governed by its own set of laws, and social status was virtually synonymous with legal status, both being hereditary. Social promotion involving the crossing of class boundaries was mainly restricted to the lower strata of society. Access to the nobility was severely hampered by the development of class-consciousness within the ranks of the feudatories, illustrated by specific rituals such as the ceremony of dubbing, as well as by a particular social ethos, lifestyle, and group mentality. It is not surprising, therefore, that the French and Italian knights settling in continental Greece and some of the Aegean islands brought with them various institutions such as vassalage – bonds of a private nature constituting the foundation of their political and social hierarchy – as well as attitudes and values common to the feudal upper class in the West in the early thirteenth century. In conformity with their own concepts and traditions, the Latin leaders distinguished, as in the West, between noblemen and non-nobles within their own society.¹⁰ It was, however, the extension of their socio-legal stratification to the indigenous population that generated the most important changes in the social fabric of their new lands.

As a result of the conquest, society in Latin Romania was divided into two distinct groups. One of these included the Latin conquerors, the western immigrants of all ranks who joined them, and their descendants; the other group comprised the indigenous Greeks, as well as Slavs in the Peloponnese. The scale of penalties to be inflicted upon those who aided Greek rebels in Crete, according to a Venetian resolution of 1273, provides a vivid expression of stratification within the Latin society and of the social cleavage separating the latter from the Greek community. Help extended to Greek rebels was to be severely punished: Latin feudatories were threatened with the loss of

their military tenements, other Latins with the loss of non-feudal assets, in addition to exile or imprisonment, while Greeks were to incur physical punishment by losing a hand and a foot.¹¹ Religious affiliation did not constitute an important factor in daily life, yet it became a basic criterion of social stratification and individual status; moreover, it provided a convenient means of group identification. Those who recognized the authority of the Roman Church were freemen; *Latinus* was synonymous with *Francus*, a word that acquired both an ethnic and a social connotation, as it meant 'westerner' as well as 'free'. On the other hand, the Greeks and Slavs, who remained faithful to the Byzantine Church, were relegated to the rank of *villani*, villeins or dependent persons, regardless of their status prior to the Latin conquest. Only few of them escaped this process of debasement and levelling. Among those who remained free we find the *archontes*: by their wealth, social ascendancy, life-style, and the fiscal exemptions some of them enjoyed at the time of the conquest, they markedly differed from the rest of the local population, like the Latin elite in the West. Freedom was also enjoyed by some other men and women of lesser standing, as well as by emancipated villeins and slaves.

It thus appears that the Latins translated the social realities they found in Romania into legal terms and ascribed the socio-legal stratification to which they were accustomed to the relatively 'open' Byzantine society, in which social mobility was more pronounced than in the West. As a result, the *archontes* encountered at the time of the conquest and their descendants became a closed socio-legal class enjoying hereditary status and privileges. The distinction between them and the villeins was recognized both in the feudal law of the Morea and neighbouring feudalized areas, as well as in Venetian courts. Unless an *archon* had sufficient proof of his status, he faced debasement: such was the case with Theodoros Makrembolites, who fled from Constantinople in 1204 and became a *paroikos* or dependent person in Corfu.¹² In Venetian Crete freedom was so exceptional among Greeks in rural areas that the free Greeks who were not *archontes* sometimes specified their status in documents, and emancipated villeins who lost the privilege granting them enfranchisement reverted to their former unfree status.¹³

The Latin conquest displaced the local elite from its dominant social position. After openly or secretly resisting the Latins for some time, several *archontes* fled from the Morea and Negroponte, while others left Crete by agreement, like the 20 *archontes* who in 1213 joined Duke Marco I Sanudo and settled on his island of Naxos. Some of the remaining *archontes* were dispossessed: others who submitted to the Latins without struggle or returned to their land and co-operated with

them retained most or all of their landed property.¹⁴ In short, the fate of the *archontes* under Latin rule greatly varied, yet in none of the conquered territories did it imply a complete break with the past. Indeed, in some fields there was continuity, while in others the accommodation between conquerors and local *archontes* gradually grew in scope in the course of the thirteenth century.

As already mentioned, Latin and Greek leaders concluded agreements in several areas of the Morea.¹⁵ These agreements at first led to the inclusion of *archontes* within the group of non-noble Latin feudatories. Since the mid-thirteenth century, however, some *archontes* achieved further social promotion: they were dubbed to knighthood and joined the ranks of the Latin or Frankish nobility. This process of social integration was also related to land holding. The Latin leaders confirmed the rights of the *archontes* to their patrimonial estates and dependent peasants, who were governed as before the conquest according to Byzantine law. In addition, the Latin leaders granted some *archontes* fiefs similar to those enjoyed by Latin feudatories, in return for military service. These and other *archontes* also held administrative positions entailing economic benefits. Social and economic interests thus prompted Greeks to seek integration within the Latin elite. On the other hand, the absence of qualified administrative personnel familiar with the Byzantine tradition and the lack of sufficient military forces account for the attitude of the princes and barons of Frankish Morea: they gradually loosened the rigid system of social and legal stratification initially devised by the conquerors. It is hardly surprising that the integration of the *archontes* and other Greeks proceeded after the return of the Byzantine forces to the Peloponnese in 1262: it was then imperative for the Frankish leaders to ensure the services and full co-operation of these Greeks.

Following the death of Prince William II of Villehardouin in 1278, the principality was governed by bailiffs on behalf of Charles I of Anjou and his successor Charles II, kings of Sicily, until Isabelle of Villehardouin and her husband Florent of Hainault took up residence there in 1289. During these 11 troubled years there was warfare between Frankish and imperial forces, and some *archontes* in the principality entertained hopes of a speedy Byzantine reconquest of the entire Peloponnese. These *archontes* requested imperial charters granting or confirming patrimonial estates and fiscal exemptions that would go into effect once the grantees came under Byzantine rule.¹⁶ Yet the Byzantine expansion was slow to proceed and was halted for extended periods of time at several occasions.¹⁷ Most *archontes*, while fully aware of this fact, anyhow believed that their interests coincided with those of their Latin lords. Their integration within the Latin elite enhanced

their position with regard to their Latin peers and, in addition, strengthened their power and social ascendancy within their own Greek community. Intermarriage between members of the Latin and Greek elites, however, seems to have been rare, save for political purposes at the princely level.

By the fourteenth century integrated Greeks displayed an eagerness to further their assimilation to the Latin elite in yet other ways. Some of them may have adhered to the Latin Church, although most Greeks remained faithful to the Orthodox creed and ritual. Of a more general nature was the strong identification of many *archontes* and other Greeks with the values, attitudes, and class-consciousness of the Latin feudatories. It is for them that an anonymous Greek author, relying on a French work, composed the fourteenth-century Greek version of the *Chronicle of Morea*, an epic exalting the Latin conquest and the Latin leaders of the Morea. Yet the acculturation of the Greek upper group to the Latin elite was never fully achieved, save perhaps in very few cases: thus, for instance, by 1350 Nicholas Misito was among the most influential men of Frankish Morea, and by 1377 his son John II was among the mightiest, which supposes a firm integration within the upper stratum of the nobility. As for the overwhelming majority of Greek feudatories, they also were undoubtedly bilingual, yet the composition of the Greek version of the *Chronicle of Morea* illustrates their preference for a Greek work suited to their own literary tradition and taste. Although subdued, Greek religious and social group consciousness come to the fore in several passages of the Greek version. In short, there was no fusion between the Latin and Greek elites, and both groups preserved their distinctive identity.¹⁸

A process of integration also occurred in Venetian Crete, yet it was neither progressive nor generalized as in the Morea, nor did it imply large scale identification with Venetian attitudes and values. It took place in stages as a response to the numerous Greek rebellions led by *archontes* that shook one or several areas of the island in the thirteenth century, and remained limited in extent. Venetian rule in Crete, as in the Morea, was based on extensive confiscations of land previously held by the state, the Greek Church and a number of *archontes*; on the existence of a permanent garrison composed of Venetian and other Latin settlers rendering military service in return for the property they held from the state; and, finally, on a strong, highly centralized administration. All these elements generated strong resentment within the Greek population, especially among its leaders. In the Byzantine period most Cretan *archontes* had presumably resided on their rural estates in the midst of their followers and dependents, where we find them after the conquest. It is not impossible, however, that some

archontes were compelled to abandon the cities along the northern coast of Crete, which the Venetians wanted to turn into military strongholds by populating them with Latins.

In order to conciliate the leading *archontes*, Venice followed a policy similar to the one adopted by the Latin lords in the Morea. She acknowledged their property rights on their large estates; in addition she granted them and some of their followers military tenements and thereby assimilated these Greeks to the Latin holders of such property. This move, initiated in 1219, enhanced the social standing of the leading *archontes*, all the more so as some of them were able to obtain the emancipation of a number of *paroikoi* or villeins held by Latin masters or the Venetian state and improve the lot of others who remained under Latin rule. Their ascendancy over the peasantry is further illustrated by the fact that numerous villeins joined them during their rebellions. In 1299 Venice went so far as to recognize the validity of the sentences pronounced by Alexius Kallergis and the judges he had appointed during his long revolt, which lasted from about 1282 until 1299. Alexius was also allowed to receive voluntary payments and services from Greeks, other than those living on his lands. It follows that, throughout the thirteenth century, social networks headed by some powerful Cretan *archontes* survived alongside the social and legal networks built and recognized by Venice. They rested on the exercise of independent judicial authority and the perpetuation of Byzantine legal, as well as fiscal institutions and practices.¹⁹

The nature, extent, and rhythm of the cumulative process of accommodation with the *archontes* in the Morea was not only different from that occurring in Crete; it also affected the Greek society of these territories in different ways. The more generalized, continuous, and profound integration of the *archontes* in the Morea deprived the local Greek population of an elite willing to provide active support to the Greek Church in its opposition to Latin rule, and to favour the Byzantine expansion in the Peloponnese initiated in 1262.²⁰ By contrast, the slow pace at which Venice rallied the leading Cretan *archontes* to her cause, as well as the latter's power, prestige, and large estates account for the alliance of many *archontes* with the Greek Church.

On the whole Venice remained suspicious of the Cretan *archontes*, in spite of agreements concluded with several of them. She therefore implemented a policy of social segregation in order to prevent inter-marriage between members of the Latin and Greek elites. Only exceptionally was the ban on mixed marriages lifted, as in 1272 and 1299, in the latter case in favour of Alexius Kallergis and his followers. Yet the number of such marriages seems to have remained small, and

the offspring of mixed parentage were mostly children of Latin fathers and Greek women of equal or lower rank, many of them illegitimate. It thus appears that the holding of military tenures did not lead to the social integration of the *archontes* within the Latin elite of Crete, save in few instances. The Latin feudatories strongly opposed the participation of the Greeks in their assemblies, which functioned in an advisory capacity within the Venetian governmental system of Crete. One of the issues closely connected with the ban on intermarriage at this social level was the determination of Venice to prevent, as far as possible, the transfer of military and other land to Greeks, and this policy was upheld well into the fourteenth century.

It is noteworthy that Venice extended institutionalized segregation to the middle and lower ranks of society in Crete. The coexistence of Latins and Greeks in urban centres, the pursuit of identical or similar economic activities, in addition to daily social and economic intercourse, threatened to erode the distinctive character of the Latin community, especially since in the Venetian colonies there was no link between occupation and social status as in feudalized areas. Venice nevertheless could not entirely prevent mixed marriages. Some Latin notaries and craftsmen are known to have wedded Greek women in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century, and intermarriage undoubtedly increased as time passed. Venice acted vigorously in the 1360s and 1370s to prevent peasant women from escaping villeinage by marrying Latins.²¹

The social evolution examined so far has revealed that the Latins' compromise with members of the Greek elite secured the survival of Byzantine institutions and practices within the framework of the Greek community. Continuity in varying degrees was to be found in landholding, jurisdiction, law, taxation, and administration. The perpetuation of the Byzantine heritage in these closely related fields was not limited, however, to the pattern of relations between the *archontes* and other Greeks. It also extended at various levels to Greeks subjected to Latin lords and even to Latins among themselves and, therefore, affected the entire social and economic fabric of Latin Romania.

We have seen that one of the main concerns of the Latin conquerors was to establish their rule on solid economic foundations. However, having no knowledge of the language in which Byzantine documents were couched, nor any familiarity with the intricate Byzantine fiscal system and its operation, they depended at the outset on those among the indigenous population who were willing to provide them with information and services needed for the partition of the land and the levy of taxes. The Latins indeed enlisted the help of local Greek leaders and former members of the imperial bureaucracy. It has been rightly

suggested that in April or May 1204 the leaders of the Fourth Crusade relied on imperial cadastral registers and other fiscal documents found in Constantinople when they divided the Byzantine empire.²² The *Chronicle of Morea* reports that in the Peloponnese the Frankish leaders consulted such records with the assistance of local *archontes*, who may have been rich landlords, former officers in charge of the imperial administration, or former military commanders. Although not explicitly stated, such collaboration also occurred in other territories of Latin Romania. In 1211 Ravano dalle Carceri, lord of the island of Negroponte, promised to maintain his Greek subjects in the status they had enjoyed under Manuel I Comnenus. This implied the continuity of landholding, as well as that of the Byzantine agrarian, legal, and fiscal regime.²³ In Crete the Venetian authorities gathered oral evidence and evidently also used cadastral registers, before taking hold of former imperial estates and confiscating the property of *archontes* and ecclesiastical institutions. Such was also the case in Venetian Messenia, where some land was attributed by the state to Venetian settlers.²⁴ As in the empire, there were always individuals, including peasants, willing to provide information about landholding, taxation, and the personal status of others.²⁵

In 1312 the Great Council of Venice ordered the Venetian governors serving in Messenia to undertake a general *anagraffi*, or survey for fiscal purposes, in the territories of Coron and Modon where it had not been carried out for a long time. The use of the Byzantine technical term *anagraphi* was coupled with the injunction that 'not a single person should be omitted'. At the same occasion it was also stated that 'according to the custom of the empire, the survey used to be carried out at the beginning of [a] thirty-year [period]'.²⁶ Thirty-year periodic surveys are indeed attested in the empire prior to the Fourth Crusade, and the injunction of 1312 indicates that this procedure had somehow survived under Venetian rule during the thirteenth century. In Messenia the data collected by the surveyors was listed in official registers called *catastica*, like the Byzantine *katasticha* or cadastral registers of the same type compiled and preserved by the imperial fisc. These registers were updated periodically by state officers, or occasionally following land transactions at the request of individuals. In the Byzantine registers each entry, called *stichos*, or 'line', corresponded to a fiscal unit and as a rule recorded the names of the responsible taxpayer and the members of his family; their common *stasis*, consisting of land, animals, other means of production, and houses; and, finally, the nature and amount of the taxes, dues and labour services they owed to the state, whether individually or collectively as members of a community comprising a whole village or part of

one. State taxes, dues, and services were occasionally awarded by the emperor, partly or entirely, to an individual or a collective beneficiary such as a monastery.²⁷ In Venetian Messenia the same registration practices are implied by the survey ordered in 1312, the use of the terms *catastica* and *stico* (from the Greek *stichos*), the updating of the fiscal entries attested at several occasions, as well as by the functions of the *veterani* or *gerontes*, village elders who dealt with, and provided evidence on fiscal matters. Yet no cadastral registers covering this region have survived. The transmission of Byzantine practices and the involvement of Greeks in this process are also illustrated by the fact that the data was recorded in Greek for more than a century after the Latin conquest. Eventually, in 1318, the Venetian Great Council ordered the governors in Messenia to translate their registers into Latin, yet the Byzantine terminology remained in use.²⁸ It also survived in Venetian Crete, where the term *catasticum* was applied to various registers listing land holdings, as well as their borders, surface, and content, including dependent peasants.²⁹

A parallel, though somewhat different development took place in the principality of the Morea, the feudalized part of the Peloponnese. The princely register, written in French and enumerating the fiefs, their holders and the services they owed, was compiled for the first time in 1209 and later updated; it was to be accessible to the Frankish leaders, their vassals and officers, and was occasionally used in the princely court.³⁰ We may safely assume that similar registers existed in the baronial courts. Yet at the level of local and manorial administration, conditions were different. An intimate knowledge of the Greek language and the complex Byzantine fiscal idiom was imperative. The co-operation of the *archontes* and native Greek-speaking bureaucracy, already mentioned, was not limited to the initial phase of Latin rule. It continued well into the second half of the fourteenth century and we find Greeks, at times several members of the same family, at all the levels of the princely, baronial and manorial administration, from the highest offices to those of simple scribes. In 1287 one Vassilopoulos appears as *protovestiarius*, the officer in charge of the wardrobe or privy purse of the prince. The Greek knight Stephanus Cutrullus or Koutroules and Johannes Murmurus or Mourmoures, who belonged to a family of Greek officers in the Morea, served in the same capacity in 1336 and 1337, respectively. The use of the Greek term for the office, rather than a western equivalent, is most significant. The *protovestiarius* handed out fiefs on behalf of the prince, controlled their content and revenue, and sold the produce of the princely estates. Nikolakos of Patras, who in 1319 or 1320 was governor of the castle of St George in

Skorta, presumably also dealt with fiscal matters.³¹ These Greek officers were obviously bilingual.

As in Venetian Messenia, the participation of Greeks in the administration, the supply of evidence and the collection of taxes in the Morea were closely related to the survival of Byzantine practices and the drafting of documents in Greek in this area. Twelve surveys or reports bearing on feudal estates, compiled between 1336 and 1379, provide important evidence in this respect.³² While lacking uniformity, these documents use the same registration techniques and are similar in content and disposition to contemporary Byzantine *praktika*, or are based on such documents. The *praktika* were fiscal inventories of specific estates copied from the imperial cadastral registers, or compiled on location and later transcribed in such registers.³³ The striking kinship of the fourteenth-century Byzantine, Moreot, and Venetian surveys points to their common twelfth-century Byzantine models. Significantly, one of the Moreot surveys, compiled in 1337, explicitly refers 'to the *praktikon* written in Greek script' (*practico in greca scriptura scripto*) drafted by Johannes Murmurus.³⁴ Some Latins may also have compiled surveys in Greek. Nicola de Boiano, a south Italian officer, was sent in 1360 by Empress Mary of Bourbon to report on her Moreot estates. While referring to several villages Nicola de Boiano wrote at one point: 'I have compiled the inventories in Greek' (*o facti li inventarii in greco*).³⁵ The continuous involvement of Greek officers in the drafting of Greek *praktika* is also attested for the thirteenth century in the island of Cephalonia and in the region of Athens. The inventory listing the properties and income of the Latin diocese of Cephalonia was confirmed by Count Riccardo Orsini in 1264.³⁶ It must have updated an earlier *praktikon*, the prototype of which was compiled prior to the Latin conquest. As for the *praktikon* referring to the region of Athens, it was copied in a thirteenth-century hand in a codex, and not on a roll as was then customary in Byzantine practice, a fact that seems to point to its execution for a Latin chancery. This hypothesis is further enhanced by the consecutive Latin numbers appearing on the two surviving folios of this survey.³⁷

There is no evidence to suggest that in feudal Morea there was a definitive switch from Greek to Latin or western idioms in fiscal surveys, similar to the one attested for Venetian Messenia. The use of Greek continued at the registration level and the transcription of surveys into Latin characters must have been made only when required by the Italian fief-holders, mostly absentee landlords, who wanted a detailed account of their feudal revenues. The replacement of Greek by Latin or the Venetian dialect in Venetian Messenia and presumably also in Crete, where it may have occurred even earlier than 1318, is

easily explained. At its highest level, the centralized Venetian colonial administration was manned by officers sent from Venice who remained overseas for short periods only, generally two years or somewhat less.³⁸ Upon their return to the metropolis, these officers had to provide detailed financial reports. The adoption of western languages in the local administration was to enable them direct access to the records and a first-hand knowledge of their content.

The original Greek data collected in Latin Romania is abundantly reflected in the Latin and Italian transcriptions in which they have survived. In the Morea, for instance, a western scribe recorded in 1357 a peasant having a *filius ypomasius* or 'nursing son'. He failed to translate into Latin the word *hypomazios* and mistook it for a proper name.³⁹ The transcription of a Greek Moreot survey into a barbarous mixture of Latin and south Italian dialect, executed in 1354, produced some amusing blunders. The bilingual Greek scribe obviously recorded the data by dictation and ascribed to the Latin letter *b* the phonetic value of the medieval Greek *beta*, which was then pronounced *v*. As a result, *vacca* or cow became in his text *bacca*, *vassalus* appears as *bassalus*, *virum* as *birum*, and the Neapolitan *da novu*, 'recently', as *da nobu*. Other oddities resulted from the literal or phonetic transcription of Greek words: thus *baltos*, 'swamp', became both *balto* and *vauldo* in the same survey of 1354.⁴⁰ At times Byzantine terms are hardly recognizable when transcribed into Latin or another western language: thus *aerikon* appears in the guise of *aricum*, *zeugaratikion* as *socaraticum*, and *kapnikon* as *capinicho*.⁴¹ In Crete practically all technical terms referring to vine-growing were of Greek origin,⁴² and this vocabulary was shared elsewhere in Latin Romania by Latin landholders and Greek peasants. The administrative idiom and the documents drafted by Latin notaries were thus heavily tainted by spoken Greek and by Byzantine terms, especially when dealing with rural taxation and landholding.

The use of the Greek language and Byzantine administrative practices, as well as the presence of Greeks in the bureaucracy of Latin Romania were closely related to a much wider phenomenon of continuity, namely the survival of imperial taxation. Byzantine commercial and maritime dues are attested in feudalized areas as well as in Venetian territories. Shortly after 1209 or 1210 Geoffrey I of Villehardouin, prince of Morea, granted the sum of 400 *hyperpyra* on the revenue derived from the *commerchium* or *kommerkion* of Corinth as a money-fief to his vassal Othon of La Roche.⁴³ This *commerchium* was presumably a custom due levied on imports and exports as in the empire. It appears again in Corinth as *chomerchio grande* in 1365, when the collection of this tax was farmed out 'according to custom' to some

Jews.⁴⁴ The *chomerchio* of the market, a sales tax, and those imposed on the shoemakers, the butchers, and others mentioned in this connection were most likely also of Byzantine origin.⁴⁵ The *messetarius*, like the Byzantine *mesites*, was an official broker supervising commercial deals and collecting the taxes imposed upon them. In the Venetian colonies the *messetarius* regularly reported to the local *officium commerchi et messetarie*, recorded in 1310 in Crete, which kept a detailed record of commercial transactions and collected the revenue gathered by the *messetarii*.⁴⁶ The *jus ligni* or *limena*, identical to the Byzantine *limeniatikon*, was a tax on ships anchoring in harbours. It is recorded in 1338 and 1354 for the port of Navarino, situated on the eastern coast of Frankish Messenia, when part of its revenue was held as money-fief by Niccolò Acciaiuoli.⁴⁷

The survival of Byzantine commercial and maritime taxes was not synonymous with strict continuity in fiscal matters. The rate of taxes did not necessarily remain unchanged under Latin rule, nor was their levy always handled in the same way as before 1204; moreover, the destination of these taxes varied. In this last respect it is essential to emphasize a fundamental difference between Venetian and feudalized territories. The collection of taxes in the former was generally entrusted to the state bureaucracy, as in the empire. The office of *messetarius* may have been the exception to this rule, as it was farmed out by auction for short periods. Yet in Venetian lands taxation remained, as in the Byzantine era, an exclusive prerogative of the state, even if temporarily granted to an individual.⁴⁸ On the other hand, in feudalized areas former imperial state taxes were privatized and their revenue flowed to the treasuries of feudal lords, regardless of the way in which they were gathered. As we have seen, these lords occasionally farmed out the collection of taxes to individuals or groups and granted income, whether entirely or partly, as money-fiefs to their vassals. In the field of taxation, continuity was obviously more pronounced under Venetian rule.

Fiscal continuity, with the limitations and variations just mentioned, is also illustrated by the taxes imposed on the peasantry. These are attested by numerous sources and especially the fourteenth-century cadastral surveys of Frankish Morea. It would be tedious to consider each of them separately,⁴⁹ yet not in all cases was there absolute continuity. The adherence to the Byzantine inheritance in matters of taxation and the way some of it was handled are revealed by the treatment of the dependent peasants who were ordained priests. In 1219 the Latin Church reached an agreement about the fiscal obligations of these priests with Venice and the lay lords of the Latin empire. This settlement, also adopted for the kingdom of Thessalonica, was partly extended in 1223 to the principality of Morea and the duchy of

Athens. All village priests, their families and servants were to be exempted from labour services, exactions and special dues once owed to the state, while paying to their lords the *acrosticum* or *akrostichon*, a tax imposed on their fiscal unit, at the rate applied during the reign of Alexius III Angelus (1195–1204); in addition they were liable to the taxes imposed by their Latin lords. A limited number of these priests, however, were granted total exemption, save for the *acrosticum*: two in villages comprising twenty-five to seventy hearths, four in somewhat larger villages, and so on.⁵⁰

These provisions recall those issued in 1144 by Emperor Manuel I Comnenus, first in favour of the rural priests who were *dēmosiarioi paroikoi*, or *paroikoi* established on state land and submitted to the imperial fisc, then to village priests living on the estates of private landlords and ecclesiastical institutions, and possibly to all rural priests. The priests were exempted from extraordinary taxes and exactions, which may have included labour, army, and fleet services to the state or payments replacing them. Yet in order to limit the loss of imperial revenue, Manuel I restricted the number of *dēmosiarioi paroikoi* enjoying the exemptions to those who were specifically registered as being entitled to them. Patriarch Luke Chrysoberges (1157–1169) claimed in 1168 that the imperial fisc had compelled village priests on state land in excess of the permitted number to perform public services. The emperor agreed that the matter should be considered by the patriarchal synod, which advocated a general exemption for all the priests who were *dēmosiarioi paroikoi*. Emperor Manuel's final decision is not known.⁵¹ At any rate, the agreements of 1219 and 1223 seem to have relied on the Byzantine regulations. On the one hand they extended certain exemptions to all village priests; on the other, they ensured the limitation of the number of exempted priests in each village, regardless of its lord, in the spirit of Emperor Manuel's legislation. The first provision satisfied the Latin Church, while the second safeguarded the interests of the lay lords. The most important conclusion to be drawn from the whole issue is that the Latins had obtained from Greek informants precise evidence on Byzantine taxes and ensured the latter's continuity as a matter of convenience, while adapting them or innovating whenever it suited their own conceptions or interests.

A similar picture emerges from the evolution of the *zovadego* in Venetian Messenia.⁵² This tax, called *zovaticum* in Latin, was obviously identical to the Byzantine *zeugaratikion* paid in wheat or in cash by peasants holding land and owning oxen. Under Venetian rule the *zovadego* was originally collected in the area of Modon only, yet not in the neighbouring district of Coron. In 1384, however, the Venetian

authorities extended this tax to peasants who held land but no plough animals. Two years later it was the turn of the state peasants in the district to be taxed. In 1414 the tax was further extended to landless peasants. Contrary to Byzantine practice, it was then paid in wheat only, except when the state officers collected overdue payments.

The specific developments connected with the *zovadego* enable us to draw some further conclusions about the lack of uniformity in Byzantine taxation. Continuity and change in fiscal matters in Messenia were not restricted to the *zovadego*. They also extended to labour services imposed on state *paroikoi*, those in the area of Modon owing 13 days a year and those in the district of Coron 12 only.⁵³ One might argue, of course, that the discrepancies between the two districts, each of which had its own *castellanus*, were due to the Venetian authorities who imported the *zovadego* from their possessions in northern Italy. Had this been the case, however, one would expect the Venetians to have introduced the new tax simultaneously in both closely connected districts, and not only in one of them. It is most likely, therefore, that after the conquest Venice found the *zeugaratikion*, a Byzantine tax similar in nature to the *zovadego*, and applied to it the term customary in some areas of northern Italy. We may thus assume that the different rates of taxation applied in each of the districts originated in the period preceding the Fourth Crusade. This would indicate that, contrary to a widely held view, there was no fiscal uniformity in the empire, even within the boundaries of a single *horion*, or large district, such as that of Patras-Modon covering the western Peloponnese.⁵⁴ It is noteworthy that the *zeugaratikion* does not appear in all the Byzantine *praktika* and was therefore not necessarily levied throughout the empire. More to the point in our context, the case of the *zovadego* clearly proves that local or regional features existing prior to 1204 were perpetuated for more than a century under Latin rule. The imposition of this tax on categories of peasants previously exempted from it and the emphasis on its payment in kind reflect the specific needs of the Venetian authorities in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, and the subtle combination of continuity, adaption, and innovation.

The Latin conquerors developed and adapted their legal traditions in Romania in accordance with their specific needs and mentality, relying on judicial precedents, borrowings, and legislation.⁵⁵ They imposed their own criminal law immediately after the conquest. In other fields, however, the transition from Byzantine to Latin rule generated more complex developments. The perpetuation of Byzantine administrative and fiscal practices was necessarily related to the survival and implementation of Byzantine law, with which the Latins likewise became acquainted.⁵⁶ It is highly significant that in all the territories of Latin

Romania the conquerors incorporated this law in their own legal system, the nature and range of this move differing according to their specific political and social regime. Jurisdiction being one of the foremost expressions of political power and authority, it was inevitable that the survival of Byzantine law should be constantly challenged and its application restricted by Latin inroads into its realm.

We are fortunate to have a first-rate source of Moreot law: the *Assizes of Romania*, a private legal treatise, the final version of which was compiled between 1333 and 1346.⁵⁷ This treatise reveals that Byzantine private law survived in the feudal principality in numerous fields. With the exception of feudal estates, it was applied to land held by Greeks, which was transmitted by equal partible inheritance, regardless of the heirs' social status or gender. This rule was equally valid for patrimonial estates owned by the Moreot *archontes* and plots of land belonging to the *staseis* or fiscal units of the *paroikoi*. It contradicted the feudal practice of primogeniture and the precedence of male over female governing the inheritance of fiefs, including those granted to *archontes*.⁵⁸ The *Assizes of Romania* also prove that land exploitation was regulated by Byzantine law. Thus the contract of *hemiseia* or *hemisophyteusia*, attested in feudal Morea as well as in Venetian Crete and Messenia, provided for the division into equal parts of newly planted trees and vines between the landlord and the peasant responsible for their cultivation. It should be noted that this and other agricultural contracts were drafted according to Byzantine models even when they involved Latin farmers tilling small plots of land.⁵⁹ In this field, then, Byzantine law definitely maintained a strong standing.

Other sources bearing on the personal status and obligations of the Greek peasantry in Latin Romania also point to the survival of Byzantine law and enable us to fill numerous gaps in our knowledge of the pre-1204 empire.⁶⁰ This is not to say that Byzantine law enjoyed a quasi-monopoly in the realm of rural landholding and exploitation or with regard to the status of the Greek peasantry. As indicated by the *Assizes of Romania*, in feudalized areas Frankish law dealt with vassalic relations, fiefs, Latin burgesses and their economic activities, yet also with Greek *archontes* or peasants and their land, in addition to jurisdiction, fiscal rights, and economic prerogatives exercised by the state prior to 1204 and taken over by landlords after the conquest.⁶¹ Paradoxically, the privatization of the state's authority benefitted not only the Latin feudal lords, but also the Greek *archontes*. Under Latin rule, the latter could fully implement Byzantine law on their estates without any state limitation or supervision.

It follows that feudal custom and Byzantine law cohabited in various

fields. This, however, did not imply the existence of clear, stable, and definitive boundaries between the two legal systems in feudalized areas. The struggle between them may be illustrated here by a specific issue: the status of the patrimonial estates owned by the Greek *archontes* in the Morea. In the thirties and forties of the fourteenth century the Latin feudatories, especially those of lower rank, seem to have resented what they perceived as a preferential treatment of their Greek peers, whose patrimonial land was exempted from the restrictive rules of primogeniture governing the inheritance of fiefs and in many cases also from military service. The feudatories therefore urged the imposition of these rules. Although not documented for an earlier period, their claim was presumably first voiced in the second half of the thirteenth century, when the number of Greek fief-holders rapidly increased, and was expressed more forcefully when *archontes* began to join the ranks of the knights. It is impossible to ascertain whether these feudatories eventually imposed their view.⁶² Whatever the case, the whole issue is indicative of the growing pressures exerted against the application of Byzantine law and the possible limitations of the fields in which it survived.

The developments in Venetian colonial territories were different, largely because the basic conception of political authority underlying Venice's legal system was similar to that of the empire. For the Venetians – as for the Byzantines – the state enjoyed a monopoly in the exercise of jurisdiction, especially criminal jurisdiction, and Venetian law was enforced whenever state rights and prerogatives were at stake.⁶³ In addition, Venice like the empire upheld the principle that state interests took precedence over private interests. As a result, Venice applied Byzantine law in a wide range of fields after integrating it into her own legal system, yet only as long as it was compatible with her interests. Venetian law of this type covered primarily state land and peasants settled on it, whether directly held by the state, granted as military holding or temporarily leased, yet also covered lordless land and peasants, as well as peasants submitted to the *archontes*. As a result, there was no room for the privatization of jurisdiction as applied in feudalized territories. Nevertheless, there was an area in which Byzantine jurisdiction and law survived in entirety: the socio-spatial networks headed by the *archontes*. The authority wielded by the *archontes* within these boundaries may have been even more extensive than in the Byzantine era as there was little state interference, save in criminal matters. Moreover, in periods of upheaval, rebellious *archontes* and the judges they appointed exercised unrestricted jurisdiction in the territories they controlled. The operation of Byzantine law within these same networks was further enhanced by the

tendency of Greeks to have recourse to their own, rather than to Latin notaries, especially when they wished to conceal from their lords or the state private transactions or avoid the expenses involved in official registration.⁶⁴ As these contracts were not recognized by Venetian courts, conflicts between the parties concerned bolstered the influence of archontal jurisdiction.

Continuity in such closely related fields as administration, taxation, landholding, law, and jurisdiction does not necessarily imply that the effects of the Latin conquest on the peasantry were limited to the replacement of a number of Greek by Latin landlords, nor that the Byzantine rural world remained practically unchanged. The survival of Byzantine terminology and institutions is somewhat deceptive, and we would fail to understand its overall implications after 1204 unless we examine the empire's inheritance in the countryside within the specific political, social, and legal context of Latin Romania.

The interaction between Byzantine and western legal and fiscal traditions is particularly obvious with regard to the *paroikoi*, called *villani* or *rustici* in Latin Romania. The eleventh- and twelfth-century evidence on the condition of the Byzantine *paroikoi* is rather meagre when compared with that available for the conquered territories. It is impossible, therefore, to determine whether all the legal restrictions enforced after 1204 on the *paroikos* and the exercise of his property rights derived from Byzantine practice. It should be stressed that by the twelfth century the Byzantine *paroikos* was still considered legally free. He thus enjoyed a status different from that of the slave, although his status was also permanent and hereditary. There were, however, some legal and practical factors limiting his freedom, and the subjection to his lord (an individual, an ecclesiastical institution, or the state) had become very tight. Various sources vividly convey the perceptions of contemporaries with respect to the condition of the *paroikos*. In a letter written between 1097 and 1104, Theophylactus of Bulgaria complained about one of his *paroikoi* 'aspiring to more liberty and desirous to shed the yoke of his *paroikia*': the issue of freedom was thus paramount to both sides. About two centuries later, around 1228, a *pronoia* holder of Thessaly used force against a *paroikos* who had refused to obey his orders and accidentally killed him. He thereafter submitted to ecclesiastical penance for his crime, yet there is no evidence that he was prosecuted by an imperial court.⁶⁵

In contrast to the Byzantine *paroikos*, the *villanus* of Latin Romania was unfree: his legal and social demotion was a feature common to areas with such different regimes as Venetian Crete, feudalized Morea and Negroponte. While this development constituted a break with the past, there were some Byzantine features that survived. In the twelfth-

century empire, the dependent peasantry was divided into two groups: *demosiarioi paroikoi*, or *paroikoi* of the state, and *paroikoi* of individuals or ecclesiastical institutions. The same two groups are to be found among the *paroikoi* or *villani* of Venetian Crete and Messenia. In these territories Venice succeeded to the Byzantine state and maintained strict supervision over the movement and distribution of the dependent peasantry, a subject to which we shall soon return. The *villani* of the state, however, seem to have enjoyed slightly better conditions than their peers submitted to individuals or to ecclesiastical institutions. The state control over individual peasants could not be as rigorous as that of other landlords, who resided on their estates or visited them regularly; on the other hand, it is true that state control was not limited by territorial boundaries. State villeins had access to public courts and they were more likely, under certain circumstances, to be freed from residential restriction, benefit from tax exemptions or be emancipated. The evolution in feudalized areas was different. The removal of imperial supervision and the disappearance of imperial public courts opened the way to the privatization of former state *paroikoi*, and to a stronger subordination of the peasants to their lords, regardless of whether these were Latins or Greeks. There still remains an unsolved problem: what happened to the free Byzantine peasants who, according to some scholars, were still to be found shortly before the Latin conquest? The Venetians may have assimilated them to the state *paroikoi*. At any rate, there is hardly any trace of free peasants in the thirteenth century Venetian colonies, save for a few individuals, and there seems to have been none in feudalized areas.⁶⁶

The different conceptions of the ruling Latin elites with regard to the nature of political authority also affected the fiscal obligations of the peasantry, which closely reflected the latter's social and legal status. In Crete and southern Messenia, Venice strictly maintained the distinction between private and public taxes and services, in conformity with Byzantine usage. Indeed, in these territories, occupied by Venice shortly after the collapse of imperial rule, the peasants' individual or collective obligations towards the state were never assimilated to those discharged to landlords, although some state taxes and labour services were permanently ceded to holders of military tenements or temporarily only to individuals leasing state land.⁶⁷ In the territories of Coron and Modon the transportation of lime and other building material, the supply of grass and straw to the Venetian governors, and the service aboard Venetian warships clearly originated in the period preceding the Fourth Crusade. It should be noted that maritime service also persisted in areas such as Tenos and Myconos that went through a period of limited feudalization before being annexed by Venice in the

course of the fourteenth century, as well as in Rhodes under the rule of the Hospitallers.⁶⁸

In spite of pronounced differences between their respective political and social regimes, the territories of Latin Romania shared a large number of legal and fiscal rules and procedures governing the status of the dependent peasant. Some of these, which were inherited from the twelfth-century empire, are unrecorded in extant Byzantine sources. Thus, for instance, the process by which a peasant became the *paroikos* of a specific landlord in the empire is revealed only by later sources from Venetian Crete, feudal Morea, and Negroponte. The subjection of the *paroikos* seems to have become binding one year after his settlement on the land of his lord, and hereditary after a period of thirty years during which the peasant and his descendants fulfilled their fiscal and manorial obligations. This thirty-year prescription was obviously connected with a similar prescription regarding land held by *paroikoi*.⁶⁹

In the empire the *paroikos* who did not pay any taxes, was not subjected to a specific landlord or the state, nor registered as *paroikos* was known as *anagraphos*, 'non-inscribed', *xenos*, 'foreigner', or *eleutheros*, 'free', while in Latin Romania his counterpart became an *extraneus* or 'foreigner'. Yet their so-called freedom did not entail any change in their legal status, as it was temporary and lasted only until they were reintegrated within the ranks of the *paroikoi* or *villani*. Fugitives could be claimed by their lords or the state, respectively, and when caught, were forcibly returned to the estate from which they had escaped if their lord or the state wished so. In Venetian territories lordless *villani* belonged to the state, while in feudalized areas these *villani* became subjected to feudal lords or *archontes*. Except for this privatization, Latin Romania thus followed Byzantine precedents with regard to the *eleutheroi* or *extranei*.⁷⁰ There is yet another Byzantine rule documented by later Latin sources only, which should be mentioned here. The issue when peasants attained legal majority entailing fiscal responsibility was raised on several occasions in Venetian Crete. Two thirteenth-century references to *paroikoi* or villeins in this island point to sixteen as the age of majority 'according to the custom of this land', or Byzantine custom.⁷¹ This rule, which has been overlooked, is of particular importance: it may enable us to assess with greater precision than in the past the reliability of the demographic data listed in the cadastral surveys of the empire and Frankish Morea, and improve thereby our quantitative interpretation of this evidence.⁷²

Continuity was also obvious in the social fabric of the Greek peasantry. The use of names and surnames, the kinship patterns, and the structure and size of families and households within the Greek peasantry of the Morea bear a strong affinity with those appearing in

fourteenth-century Byzantium. As revealed by the Moreot sources of this period, there were striking variations between neighbouring areas, villages, and even portions of the same villages held by different landlords with respect to the relative, fluctuating number of vertically extended, laterally extended, or nuclear families. On the whole, the kinship patterns reflect the existence of relatively stable families and households in villages shielded from warfare for long periods of time.⁷³ Nuclear families, however, seem to predominate, especially in newly resettled areas along common borders with the empire.⁷⁴ Extensive migration due to various factors was facilitated by the political fragmentation of Latin Romania.⁷⁵ The evidence on the Cretan peasantry does not enable us to arrive at a quantitative evaluation of migration, as for fourteenth-century Morea.⁷⁶ Yet we may safely assume that on the island the frequent revolts of the thirteenth century and their repression had a destabilizing effect on the peasantry in specific areas. Migration mainly occurred within the island, the escape to other territories being more difficult than in continental Greece.⁷⁷

Occasionally the sources, especially those of Venetian Messenia, offer a glimpse of the functions of the village community operating as a fiscal entity and as a social body defending its collective rights against the landlord or the state. Here again the affinity with the empire is striking.⁷⁸ The village elders, known as *gerontes*, *protogerontes*, *homines seniores*, *homines antiqui*, *anciani*, or *veterani*, provided information to surveyors on landholding and taxation, carried out surveys of land boundaries when ordered to do so, presented the peasants when an inquest was made, and were responsible for the collection of certain taxes and their transfer to the landlord, or to the state as in Venetian Messenia. They were involved in legal matters, whether in an advisory capacity or as court agents. They also convened their fellow peasants and represented their interests when necessary. In short, they served as intermediaries between the villeins and the landlord or the state. The *gerontes* were most likely rich peasants who inherited their particular social standing within the village community. In Venetian Messenia the governors annually entrusted a number of them with specific administrative responsibilities.⁷⁹

Latin rule ensured the supremacy of the Roman Church in the conquered territories and generated important changes in the life and organization of the Greek Church.⁸⁰ Our main concern here is with the social implications of these changes, rather than with their reflection in the ecclesiastical body. To be sure, the Latins promised at several occasions to maintain the Greek Church and its religious practice, yet it was forcefully subjected to papal authority and supervision, gradually stripped of its higher ranks, and weakened by large scale confiscations

of its property and income. The Latin conquest of Constantinople severely diminished the prospects of reconciliation between the Latin and Greek churches, and the aggressive propaganda of the Dominicans and Franciscans further antagonized the Greeks. Following a short period of demoralization in the aftermath of the conquest, Greek priests and monks engaged in passive resistance to Latin domination. Some of them went even further and actively co-operated with the Greeks of Epirus and those of Nicaea, yet without notable effects. Latin political and ecclesiastical domination were interwoven and this was especially true in Venetian territories.

Considering the Latin Church an instrument of government, Venice repeatedly interfered in ecclesiastical appointments, exerting a strong control on the activities of both Latin and Greek ecclesiastical bodies, and preventing the Latin Church from taking any action she considered as dangerous to peace and stability within her territories.⁸¹ Neither Venice nor the feudal lords were eager to encourage the adhesion of Greeks to the Latin Church, especially on a large scale by villeins. Such a move would have disrupted the existing social order, since members of the Roman Church were considered freemen.⁸² It is obvious, therefore, why a change in the status of the villeins was strongly opposed by their lords. The number of Greeks joining the Roman Church in any case remained small,⁸³ a fact that was closely related to the evolution of the Greek Church under Latin rule.

The evolution of the Greek Church was in a way paradoxical. Despite the blows suffered, it displayed a remarkable vitality at the popular level, especially in rural areas where *papates* or priests and monks lived among the Greek laymen and shared their fate. As already noted, most *papates* were villeins.⁸⁴ In Crete, moreover, the Greek Church enjoyed the constant support of the *archontes* who, as before the conquest, exercised rights of patronage entailing economic benefits over monasteries and churches and repeatedly intervened on behalf of these institutions or individual monks and priests, as illustrated by their treaties with the Venetian government. In 1299 Alexius Kallergis even received permission to negotiate with the Roman Church in order to ensure the consecration of a Greek bishop in Crete. Such a prelate is mentioned in 1331 at Milopotamo.⁸⁵

The attitudes within the Greek community are well reflected in the writings of Marino Sanudo, an acute Venetian observer of Latin Romania. Around 1330, more than a century after the imposition of Latin rule, he described the situation in Cyprus, Rhodes, the Morea, Euboea, Crete, and other Aegean islands in the following terms: 'Although these places are subjected to the rule of the Franks and obedient to the Roman Church, almost all the population is Greek and

is inclined toward this sect [namely, the Greek Church], and their hearts are turned toward Greek matters, and when they can show this freely, they do so.'⁸⁶ Indeed, the Greek Church acted as a cultural focus and played a major role in the crystallization of a new Greek collective identity, in which religious and ethnic responses to Latin rule merged, and which had long-term effects, especially in Venetian territories. Occasionally it manifested itself openly, as noted by Marino Sanudo. In the fifteenth century the influx of Greek clergymen from Byzantine territories aroused religious and social unrest on several occasions.⁸⁷ More indicative perhaps of the permanent mood within the Greek community in this period are two dedicatory inscriptions painted in 1436 and 1445 respectively, and displayed in two small Cretan churches commissioned by priests.⁸⁸ Both inscriptions mention Emperor John VIII Palaeologus in their dating and thus clearly proclaim the Byzantine allegiance of the Greek clergy, undoubtedly shared by the majority of Greek laymen. These Cretan inscriptions sharply contrast with those found in thirteenth- and early fourteenth-century archontic churches in the Morea and Negroponte, which bear no reference to emperors.⁸⁹

The evolution of the Greek Church and its determinant role in the shaping of new attitudes were also fostered by the weak standing of the Latin Church in the conquered territories.⁹⁰ Most Latins were settled in urban centres along the Greek coasts. Elsewhere Latin laymen were scattered and lived in small communities established in inland cities and rural areas. Such was also the case with Latin monks, who remained few in number and on the whole failed to expand in Latin Greece.⁹¹ Under these circumstances, massive investments in ecclesiastical buildings were neither necessary nor possible. In the thirteenth and first half of the fourteenth century the Latins were mostly content with the enlargement and embellishment of existing Greek churches and monasteries, and built only few new churches.⁹²

One of the main functions assigned to the Roman Church in the conquered territories was the promotion and preservation of Latin solidarity and collective identity, especially important in the midst of a much more numerous and occasionally hostile Greek population. The Roman Church, however, was severely weakened by the lack of priests in sufficient numbers, especially inland, and the absenteeism of the higher clergy. As it was unable to supply ecclesiastical services to many small, scattered Latin communities, growing numbers of Latins turned to Greek priests and monks, received sacraments according to the Greek rite, and mingled with Greek laymen at religious services. Such a case occurred in Melos during a five-year vacancy in the local Latin church, which ended in 1253 when Pope Innocent IV responded to the appeal of the Latin population of the island and appointed a new

bishop. In the thirteenth century there must have been similar cases elsewhere. Religious symbiosis in Latin Romania is better documented for the following two centuries. Although limited in scope and largely restricted to common worship, this symbiosis, in addition to inter-marriage, daily social and economic intercourse between Greeks and Latins, and a growing knowledge of Greek among the latter, generated some degree of hellenization that worried the papacy, the Latin lay lords, and the Venetian government. They feared the assimilation of the Latins to their Greek neighbours, and took various measures to prevent this process, such as institutionalized ethnic segregation in Crete.⁹³ All these phenomena, however, did not blur the distinctive identity of the Latin and Greek communities, which pursued their separate existence.

The economic evolution of the western provinces of the empire between the twelfth and the fourteenth century was also marked by continuity, adaptation, and change. In the twelfth century the economy of this region was largely shaped by a set of interconnected factors.⁹⁴ Land was the main source of income, wealth, and taxation, large estates constituting the major element in this context. Local *archontes*, to whom many of these estates belonged, played a dominant role in both the rural and urban economy. Their attitudes and interests were largely responsible for the slow development of a market economy supported by manufacture and trade in some urban centres, and by extra-regional trade largely oriented towards Constantinople.

Let us now briefly examine these factors. Large estates owned or held by the imperial fisc, members of the imperial and other prominent families as well as by ecclesiastical institutions of the capital, local *archontes*, churches and monasteries, are well attested for the period of the conquest.⁹⁵ There is no direct evidence about the structure, management, or profitability of these estates. However, from Byzantine sources referring to other provinces of the empire and later evidence bearing on Latin Romania we may gather that they usually consisted of small peasant holdings directly exploited by *paroikoi*, and of demesne land cultivated with the help of compulsory labour services provided by *paroikoi* or slaves, joined by a salaried labour force (*misthioi*) and by peasants leasing small scattered tracts of land from rich landlords.⁹⁶ These estates raised livestock and mainly produced wheat, olive oil, wine, various fruits, wool, and raw silk.

From the writings of Michael Choniates, self-exiled archbishop of Athens, it would seem that the countryside of Attica and neighbouring areas were severely suffering from desertion, neglect by absentee landlords, attacks by pirates, and above all fiscal oppression by greedy

and corrupt tax-collectors.⁹⁷ It is likely, however, that this picture is somewhat biased and mainly reflects the evils besetting ecclesiastical estates; at best it is valid for specific small areas only. In the twelfth century the empire enjoyed demographic stability and a flourishing agriculture. More specifically, most *archontes* were presumably not defenceless like ecclesiastical institutions when it came to taxation. This was particularly the case with powerful *archontes*, who often held positions in the administrative or military hierarchy of the empire. These *archontes* must have enjoyed substantial revenues accruing from their estates, their urban property, and their official functions or dignities.⁹⁸ These revenues go far to explain the power they wielded and their ability to offer protection to, and muster extensive support within the local Greek population. At the time of the conquest, power and social standing, rather than economic development, were at the top of the *archontes*' priorities and were closely related to their ideal of self-sufficiency.⁹⁹ We may therefore assume that they were willing to go to considerable expense in order to obtain and maintain a following, as well as to acquire and display status symbols. On the other hand, it is most unlikely that they should have heavily invested or innovated in their estates, while monasteries were more willing to do so as they were not concerned about social standing. The development of an increasingly market-oriented economy in continental Greece in the course of the twelfth century hardly affected the attitudes of lay landlords with regard to land use, management, or marketing. The same holds true, it seems, of ecclesiastical institutions, which for different reasons strove to achieve self-sufficiency, a goal that could be all the more easily attained when a monastery held land in different areas, as St John of Patmos did on that island and in Crete.¹⁰⁰

The growth of manufacture in the eleventh and twelfth centuries mainly occurred in the framework of numerous small, scattered workshops, and this was also the case with the silk and glass industries. The concentration of craftsmen remained limited to few specific urban centres, primarily Corinth, Thebes, and Sparta.¹⁰¹ In continental Greece local *archontes* were the dominant element in the urban economy. Their estates supplied agricultural commodities and industrial raw materials, the most important of which was raw silk. They owned shops and dwellings in the cities, controlled local manufacturing to some extent, and occasionally provided capital for commercial ventures.¹⁰² Yet, on the other hand, their involvement in urban life seriously hampered the development of a sizeable mercantile group, free trade, and a full-fledged market economy. These *archontes* generally lived in cities fairly close to their estates, which presumably ensured their own supply and that of many of their urban followers and

dependents. Moreover, *archontes* and monasteries often delivered the surplus of their estates directly to regional fairs and consumer markets, and in rather exceptional cases to large distant markets, primarily Constantinople, by using their own agents and ships rather than independent intermediaries.¹⁰³ We may safely assume that to some extent the agents overseeing the estates of Constantinopolitan owners acted similarly and also shipped some of their merchandise directly to the capital.

It is within this extra-regional trade pattern, largely geared towards Constantinople, the main emporium of the empire, that Venetian traders expanded their operations since the second half of the eleventh century; they were followed by other Latins. The range and consequences of their intrusion into the Byzantine market have been grossly overestimated.¹⁰⁴ Venetian traders were primarily attracted to western Greece and Crete by agricultural produce and some luxury items, such as raw silk and silken cloth, which they seem to have often purchased from local *archontes*. Their exemption from Byzantine taxation, as well as their combination of innovative commercial techniques, trade, and shipping, gave them a definite edge over Byzantine competitors. At first they operated between the western provinces and Constantinople, but very soon they took advantage of their simultaneous links with the empire and particularly its capital, Alexandria, and Venice, and from the last quarter of the eleventh century they shipped grain, oil, Cretan cheese, and precious wares to these destinations.¹⁰⁵ In the twelfth century, Venetian and other Italian traders appear to have gradually replaced the Byzantines on the maritime route linking Constantinople with Alexandria. The impact of the Italians' activity on the Byzantine economy and on urban life in the western provinces seems to have been restricted to specific localities enjoying a modest infusion of western capital, a growth in population, and a boom in construction.¹⁰⁶ The volume of capital, shipping tonnage, and manpower invested by the Latins in Romania was still small, compared with what it became in the second half of the thirteenth century. It was limited by the heavy Italian involvement in trade with Egypt and the crusader Levant and, more generally, by a negative balance of trade with the East.¹⁰⁷ In sum, the western provinces fulfilled a marginal role within the framework of the empire's economy, and this role was not basically altered by twelfth-century developments.

The following century witnessed important changes in the economy of the region that came under Latin rule, generated by the dismantling of the Byzantine empire in the wake of the Fourth Crusade, amplified by long-lasting demographic, social, and economic processes in the West, and shaped by factors specific to Latin Romania. As a result, this

vast area was entirely drawn into the economic orbit of the West, and its orientation markedly changed.¹⁰⁸ To be sure, land remained the main factor of its economy, the rural infrastructure was hardly affected by the conquest, and the patterns of agricultural production on the whole persisted. This continuity is attested by the survival of Byzantine administrative, fiscal, and legal institutions and practices, by the structure of the large Moreot estates described in the fourteenth-century surveys, save for a few innovations discussed below, and by numerous agricultural contracts dealing with the cultivation of small plots of land and the raising of livestock.¹⁰⁹ In the aftermath of the conquest, however, there were some major changes in agricultural management, production, and marketing.

As a result of expropriation, most land was transferred from Greek to Latin landlords. This shift severely curtailed the share of the *archontes* and the Greek monasteries in the rural economy as well as their impact on cities and trade. More importantly, it established a new pattern of interaction between these three factors. In varying degrees, though definitely more than their predecessors, the Latin landlords were aware of the economic benefits resulting from co-operation with an expanding group of traders and craftsmen, which after the conquest comprised numerous Latins established in cities involved in maritime trade.¹¹⁰ This awareness was shared by the conquering knights, who highly valued investments in social standing, and by Latin burgesses, particularly Italians. All these new settlers originated in areas of the West experiencing by 1200 an ever stronger interaction between the rural world and a developed urban economy.¹¹¹ It is hardly surprising that after a short period the Greek *archontes* should also have adopted the approach of their Latin peers.

We have seen that before the conquest *archontes* and ecclesiastical landlords were the main source of liquid capital, albeit in small amounts. The strictly localized infusions of additional capital provided by Latin traders did not basically alter the nature of the Byzantine economy, although it foreshadowed later developments. The conquest, however, broke the strong hold of the landlords on the financing of economic activities and abolished the last restrictive barriers of Byzantine state control. It thus enabled the free flow of cash between various sectors of the economy. Several demographic and economic factors also contributed to this crucial mutation: the permanent settlement or temporary stay of Latins in cities, especially coastal cities along the main maritime lanes, or their presence in castles as in the Morea; the population growth in coastal cities; the supply of goods and services to traders and ships in transit; finally, the expanding demand for specific agricultural commodities in Venice, the Angevin kingdom of

Sicily, and other areas of the West. The growing volume of demand and exchange, particularly in connection with long-distance trade, generated an influx of cash that stimulated the economy of Latin Romania, and so did new forms of credit and profit-sharing ventures.¹¹²

The incentives provided by the new economic pattern had a major impact on the agricultural sector, and account for the growth in productivity and total output. Agricultural production in the fertile areas of Latin Romania, especially the Peloponnese and Crete, became increasingly geared to export in the course of the thirteenth century. The sale of Cretan wheat to Venice began in the late sixties. Since 1281 the Venetian government occasionally guaranteed Cretan producers and traders higher prices than on the free market, in order to ensure a massive supply of this commodity. Wine, raisins, oil, cheese, hides, wool, silk, honey, and kermes, a dye-material, were also in high demand in the West. Latin landlords and Greek *archontes*, living on their land or in its vicinity, enhanced security, stability, and continuity in cultivation, and were among the main beneficiaries of growth in output. Burgesses investing in agricultural ventures and peasants farming their own or leased land and raising cattle also had a share in the prosperity it generated.¹¹³

It should be noted that the increase in agricultural produce was largely achieved within the inherited agrarian and social structures. Eventually, however, the urge to ensure growing profits determined a departure from Byzantine traditions in the management of large estates. This process is documented for the fourteenth century, although it may have begun earlier. From the Moreot surveys it appears that the agents of some absentee Italian fief-holders increased agricultural output by introducing structural changes in the organization and exploitation of their employers' large estates, together with new types of cultures and new agricultural techniques. They established large farms of a kind known in southern Italy as *massarie*, directly exploited by the landlord with the help of the peasants' labour services and hired labour. In the Morea these farms were mainly devoted to intensive cultivation based on irrigation and the use of manure. The agents also improved the marketing process of agricultural produce by co-operating with Italian traders active in the coastal towns of the Peloponnese. The commercial approach of the Italian landlords to their estates is well illustrated by the survey of the area of Corinth compiled in 1365 for Niccolò Acciaiuoli, member of a Florentine banking family: this survey displays registration techniques and double-entry book-keeping similar to those used by contemporary Italian trading and banking firms.¹¹⁴ In spite of fluctuations in agricultural production, it seems that on the whole the countryside of Latin

Romania was more prosperous than before the conquest, except in areas devastated and depopulated by warfare and piracy.¹¹⁵

Little is known about the organization and productive capacity of crafts and industries in Latin Romania. The greater concentration of population in urban centers obviously enhanced the production of wares for the local consumer market. However, there was no growth in export industries, with the exception perhaps of tanning. The silk industry appears to have declined. The large-scale export to the West of raw silk and kermes is indicative in this respect, though the silk workshops also remained active. Between 1300 and 1330 a Jewish entrepreneur of Negroponte supplied silk and dyes to local craftsmen. The production of samit continued, but was not sufficient to enable sizeable exports. Significantly, neither the survey of 1365 covering Corinth, nor sources bearing on Thebes mention the manufacture of silk in these cities, known for their industry in the twelfth century.¹¹⁶ Glass production also seems to have declined, presumably in connection with its rise in Venice in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. Greek craftsmen and painters in this city were then involved in the manufacturing of large amounts of glass vessels intended for export to Romania.¹¹⁷ Latin Romania increasingly became a supplier of raw materials for industries in the West and absorbed the latter's finished products. The economic development of the cities determined their demographic growth and altered their relative importance. The course of land and sea routes was gradually adjusted so as to integrate them into the new supply system of the area. In addition to economic factors, however, the pattern of Latin settlement as well as the foundation of new urban centres, such as Canea in Crete and Clarence in the Morea, were also related to political and military developments. In some cases the latter affected the level of economic activity: in 1365 the *commercium* of Corinth, a city suffering from Catalan raids in the area, was leased for the sum of 340 *hyperpyra*, rather small considering the city's location and bustling economy in the twelfth century.¹¹⁸

An important departure from Byzantine economic patterns occurred in yet another field. To be sure, Greeks continued to participate in local and regional land trade, as at seasonal fairs like the one held in 1296 at Vervena, in the region of Skorta, where a Byzantine *archon* came to sell his raw silk.¹¹⁹ Greeks were also involved in short-range and regional maritime trade and shipping.¹²⁰ Yet Venetians and other Latin settlers in this area participated in growing numbers in these activities at the expense of indigenous merchants and ship operators, and since the 1270s local Greek traders in the Aegean seem to have increasingly relied on Latin crafts. The influx of capital derived from long-distance commerce and transport, and the protection

provided by Venice to its citizens and subjects settled and active in various cities of Latin Romania. Local and regional trade and shipping were increasingly subordinated to the requirements, course, and rhythm of this long-distance activity, which became the almost exclusive preserve of Venetian citizens acting as itinerant merchants. The Venetian web of commercial outposts established on foreign soil and colonies under direct state rule greatly fostered the range, variety, and volume of Venetian maritime trade flowing within and through Latin Romania. The overwhelming importance in this area of Venetian coinage, which replaced that of Byzantium, is but one aspect of the economic hegemony of Venice. Thanks to its geographical position and to Venetian activity, Latin Romania became firmly integrated within the triangular eastern Mediterranean trade pattern linking the Black Sea, Constantinople, and the imperial lands, with the crusader and Muslim Levant as well as with the West.¹²¹

The Latin conquest was followed by a definite rupture on three different levels. First, political power became a Latin monopoly, although its exercise differed in feudalized and non-feudalized territories. Secondly, the new social stratification, common to all territories regardless of their specific political and social regime, was not only a reflection of the conquerors' social attitudes, but also an instrument of domination and as such an expression of their political power. Thirdly, the symbiotic relationship that developed between Latins and Greeks in daily life did not conceal the persistent, only marginally bridged rift, which existed between the two communities, nor their contrasting orientation, with strong Latin links to the West and the Greeks firmly rooted in the Byzantine past. It is within these parameters that the evolution of Latin Romania took place in the first century or so after the conquest.

Latin pragmatism and flexibility, as well as the strength inherent in the Byzantine institutional and operational infrastructure account for the large measure of continuity displayed by the rural world of Latin Romania. The Greek peasantry and the rural economy constituted the main sources of revenue of the Latin elite and the Venetian government, who maintained the Byzantine social and economic fabric as long as it furthered their interests, did not restrict their exercise of power and authority, or endanger the Latins' collective survival. The continuity of microeconomic structures, also expressed in legal and operational terms, extended even further to crafts as well as to local and regional trade. It is most significant that the great shift that occurred in the economic evolution of Latin Romania only marginally affected these structures.

Continuity was most pronounced in the portion of the Greek community headed by the *archontes*, which functioned as an aggregation of autonomous socio-spatial networks. In this framework the *archontes* preserved their traditional standing, based on rural wealth in an initially underdeveloped market economy, and to some extent acted as heirs to the Byzantine state. In the absence of any system of power-sharing, the exercise of their traditional authority within the Greek community served as a safety-valve for the Latins. The co-ordination of the Greek social networks with the political, social, and economic superstructures instituted by the Latins was an expression of the latter's accommodation, imperative for a small ruling minority intent on preserving its group identity in the midst of an overwhelmingly indigenous population. The interpenetration of Byzantine and western elements at the institutional level was of a general nature, although Byzantine and Latin conceptions of political authority often clashed, particularly in feudalized areas. This is yet another aspect of the Latins' attitude to the Byzantine environment, and the measure of accommodation they were willing to accept. In sum, continuity, adaptation, and change were interconnecting and intersecting phenomena in Latin Romania.

NOTES

1. For an extensive bibliography, see my chapter 'Social Evolution in Latin Greece', in K.M. Setton (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, Vol. 6 (Madison, WI, 1989), pp. 175–221, on which some sections of this study rely, though from a different perspective.
2. For a recent, concise survey of this process, see M. Angold, *The Byzantine Empire, 1025–1204: A Political History* (London and New York, 1984), pp. 263–83. More specific are J. Hoffman, *Rudimente von Territorialstaaten im byzantinischen Reich (1071–1210). Untersuchungen über Unabhängigkeitsbestrebungen und ihr Verhältnis zu Kaiser und Reich* (Munich, 1974); N. Oikonomidès, 'La décomposition de l'empire byzantin de 1204 et les origines de l'empire de Nicée: à propos de la "Partitio Romaniae"', *XV^e Congrès international d'études byzantines. Rapports et co-rapports* (Athens, 1976) (hereafter *CIEB*, 15), I/1, pp. 1–22; J.-Cl. Cheynet, 'Philadelphie, un quart de siècle de dissidence, 1182–1206', in H. Ahrweiler (ed.), *Philadelphie et autres études*, Byzantina Sorbonensia, 4 (Paris, 1984), pp. 39–54; R. Radić, 'Odpacni gospodari i vizantiji krajem XII i prvim dečenijama XIII veka' (Local rulers in Byzantium at the end of the twelfth and in the first decades of the thirteenth century), *Zbornik radova vizantološkog instituta*, 24/25 (1986), 151–283 [English summary, pp. 283–90].
3. For more details, see below.
4. On the Morea, see D. Jacoby, 'The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade', *American Historical Review*, 78 (1973), 875–6, 879–91, repr. in id., *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XII^e au XV^e siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies* (London, 1979), No. II; also id., 'Social Evolution', pp. 189–92. On the island of Negroponte in the thirteenth century, see D. Jacoby, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les 'Assises de Romanie': sources, application et diffusion* (Paris–The

- Hague, 1971), pp.185–211. Only the Venetian quarter in the city of Negroponte escaped feudal rule.
5. See Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.237–9, 242–52, 271–80, 284, and id., 'Social Evolution', pp.191–2, 200. B.J. Slot, *Archipelagus turbatus: les Cyclades entre colonisation et occupation ottomane c.1500–1718* (Istanbul, 1982), Vol. 1, pp.35–65, has some useful remarks relevant to our subject.
 6. For a general view, see F. Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne au Moyen Age. Le développement et l'exploitation du domaine colonial vénitien (XII^e–XV^e siècles)*, 2nd edn. (Paris, 1975), with an updated bibliography, pp.467–81, pp.73ff., and numerous studies, several of which are now available in his *Etudes sur la Romanie gréco-vénitienne (X^e–XV^e siècles)* (London, 1977); see also S. Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano a Creta nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1963), which includes numerous excerpts from unpublished sources; id., *Studi sulle colonie veneziane in Romania nel XIII secolo* (Naples, 1966). On the use of feudal terminology in Venetian Messenia and Crete see Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.225–6, 295–7, and E. Santschi, *La notion de 'feudum' en Crète vénitienne, XIII^e–XV^e siècles* (Montreux, 1976), useful on the status of military tenures in Crete, but mistaken about 'feudalism' in the island.
 7. For what follows, see n. 4 above, and Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.180–82, 185. For recent work on the Byzantine elite in general, see A.P. Kazhdan, *Social'nyi sostav gosподstvujuščego klassa Vizantii XI–XII vv.* (Moscow, 1974), summarized by I. Sorlin, 'Bulletin byzantino-slave. Publications soviétiques sur le XII^e siècle', *Travaux et mémoires du Centre de Recherche d'Histoire et Civilisation Byzantines* (hereafter *Travaux et mémoires*), 6 (1976), 367–80; the papers of the symposium on *The Byzantine Aristocracy* (BAR International Series, 221), ed. M. Angold (Oxford, 1984), especially M. Angold, 'Archons and Dynasts: Local Aristocracies and the Cities of the Later Byzantine Empire', *ibid.*, pp.236–53; A.P. Kazhdan and A.W. Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–London, 1985), pp.56–73; see also J. Herrin, 'Realities of Byzantine Provincial Government: Hellas and Peloponnesos, 1180–1205', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 26 (1975), 253–84, and E. Malamut, 'Les îles de la mer Egée de la fin du XI^e siècle à 1204', *Byzantion*, 52 (1982), 344–8.
 8. On the *paroikos*, see pp.16–18, 20–23 below.
 9. The most vigorous proponent of the 'feudalization' view was G. Ostrogorsky in numerous works and especially in his *Pour l'histoire de la féodalité byzantine* (Brussels, 1954), pp.9–61. For my criticism of his argumentation, see Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 876–9, with bibliographical references, and id., 'Social Evolution', pp.182–5. A. Carile, 'Sulla *pronoia* nel Peloponneso bizantino anteriormente alla conquista latina', *Zbornik radova*, 16 (1975), 55–61, has contested my views and asserted that the *pronoia* was to be found in the Morea before 1204, although he fails to provide conclusive evidence to this effect. Moreover, his claim that there was continuity between *pronoia* and fief is not convincing, as he disregards the basic differences between the rules of succession governing the patrimonial estates of the *archontes* and the fiefs granted by Frankish lords. The fiefs, also called *pronoiai* in Greek sources, were transmitted solely according to primogeniture, while the former estates were equally divided between all heirs, whether male or female: on this subject, see D. Jacoby, 'Les archontes grecs et la féodalité en Morée franque', *Travaux et mémoires*, 2 (1967), 451–63, repr. in D. Jacoby, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine (XIII^e–XV^e siècles)* (London, 1975), No. VI. Writing around 1220, John Apocaukus, metropolitan of Naupactus, mentions Greeks held *eis pronoian* by Latins: N.A. Bees, 'Unedierte Schriftstücke aus der Kanzlei des Johannes Apokaukos des Metropoliten von Naupaktos (in Aetiolen)', *Byzantinische-neugriechische Jahrbücher*, 21 (1971–74; published in 1976), 132, No. 71, ll. 66–8. It is most unlikely that he should have used *pronoia* in a technical sense as equivalent to 'fief'; the term in this context rather means 'provision', or else refers to the Byzantine *pronoia*, with which the metropolitan was well acquainted.

10. See n.4 above and Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.197–8.
11. R. Cessi (ed.), *Deliberazioni del Maggior Consiglio di Venezia* (Bologna, 1931–50), Vol. 2, pp.342–3, No. XV.
12. Demetrius Chomatianus, ed. J.B. Pitra, *Analecta sacra et classica spicilegio solesmensi parata*, Vol. 7 (Rome, 1891), col. 228, No. L.
13. See D. Jacoby, 'Les états latins en Roumanie: phénomènes sociaux et économiques (1204–1350 environ)', *CIEB*, 15, I/3, pp.23–4, 41–2, repr. in Jacoby, *Recherches*, No. I.
14. See Jacoby, 'Les *archontes*', pp.430–32, 443; P. Magdalino, 'A Neglected Authority for the History of the Peloponnese in the Early Thirteenth Century: Demetrios Chomatianos, Archbishop of Bulgaria', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 70 (1977), 316–23. The *archontes* of Euboea are mentioned as *magnates greci* in 1209 and 1216: G.L.Fr. Tafel und G.M. Thomas, *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig* (Vienna, 1856–57) (hereafter T Th), Vol. 2, pp.92, 95, 183. Michael Chalkoutzes, a rich, powerful *archon*, abandoned this island: see the letters of the expatriate Greek archbishop of Athens Michael Choniates, written between 1208 and 1214: Sp. P. Lampros, *Michael Akominatou tou Choniatou ta sōzomena* (Athens, 1879–80), Vol. 2, pp.276–80. Indirect evidence on the *archontes* of Negroponte is also provided by seven small Greek churches built and decorated between 1303 and 1311 in the region of Kyme, in central Euboea, presumably by the same atelier; the work was most likely commissioned by *archontes*, and not by wealthy free peasants as suggested by J. Koder, *Negroponte. Untersuchungen zur Topographie und Siedlungsgeschichte der Insel Euböia während der Zeit der Venezianerherrschaft* (= *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos. histor. Klasse, Denkschriften*, Vol. 112.) (Vienna, 1973), p.172; on these churches, see *ibid.*, pp.51, 159–64. The agreement of Marco I with Venice is edited by T Th, Vol. 2, pp.159–66, and especially p.163; for its dating, see J.K. Fotheringham, *Marco Sanudo, Conqueror of the Archipelago* (Oxford, 1915), p.97, n.1.
15. For what follows on the Morea, see Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 891–903, and *id.*, 'Knightly Values', 163–79.
16. One case appears in a letter by Gregory of Cyprus, patriarch of Constantinople * from 1283 to 1289, referring to two Greeks holding patrimonial land in Arcadia, a district of the northern Morea: see S. Eustratiades (ed.), 'Tou sophotatou kai logistotatou oikoumenikou patriarchou kyrou Gregorion tou Kypriou epistolai', *Ekklesiastikos pharos* (Alexandria), 5 (1910), pp.348–9, No. 181; the relevant passages of this letter appear in D.A. Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec de Morée. II. Vie et institutions* (2nd edn., London, 1975), p.194, n. 1. The other case, dated 1288, involved the possession of Kranidion in the Argolid although it was then under Frankish rule: see F. Dölger, 'Ein Chrysobull des Kaisers Andronikos II. für Theodoros Nomikopulos aus dem Jahre 1288', *Orientalia christiana periodica*, 21 (1958), 58–62, repr. in *id.*, *Paraspora* (Ettal, 1961), pp.189–93. On the political situation in these years, see A. Bon, *La Morée franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1403)* (Paris, 1969), pp.145–6, 154, 164–6; on limited Greek revolts then and later, see n.21 below.
17. On agreements reached between Byzantines and Franks in this period, see D. Jacoby, 'Un régime de coseigneurie gréco-franque en Morée: les "casaux de parçon"', *Ecole Française de Rome, Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, 75 (1963), 189–228, repr. in *id.*, *Société de démographie*, No. VIII.
18. On the Misito family, see Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 895; on possible conversion to the Roman creed, see the evidence provided by two Greek inscriptions dated 1244/1245 and 1354, respectively, *ibid.*, 898; *id.*, 'Les états latins', pp.25–6; see n. 89 below. On the attitude of the Greek Church towards mixed marriages, see D.M. Nicol, 'Mixed Marriages in Byzantium in the Thirteenth Century', *Studies in Church History*, 1 (1964), 160–72, especially 168, n. 4, repr. in *id.*, *Byzantium: Its Ecclesiastical History and Relations with the Western World* (London, 1972), No.

- IV; H. Hunger, 'Byzantinisches Eherecht im 14. Jahrhundert: Theorie und Praxis', *Zbornik radova*, 14/15 (1973), 65–79.
19. On developments in Venetian Crete, see n. 6 above; Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.26–33, especially p.28. On the villeins, id., 'Social Evolution', pp.200–5. A petition of c.1224–25 submitted by Cretan Greeks mentions expulsions from the city and area of Candia: G. Cervellini (ed.), *Documento inedito veneto-cretese del dugento* (Padua, 1906), pp.13–18. On the standing and influence of Alexius Kallergis in Crete, see also P. Topping, 'Co-existence of Greeks and Latins in Frankish Morea and Venetian Crete', *CIEB*, 15, 1/3, pp.15–17, repr. in id., *Studies on Latin Greece*, No. XI.
 20. The few instances of revolt after the return of Byzantium to the Peloponnese were rather exceptional and did not reflect the general attitude of the *archontes*; see Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 902–3.
 21. See Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.202–5, and especially nn. 44–5; on Marco Venier and his Greek wife Zoe, see also a document dated 1263 published by A. Stussi, *Studi e documenti di storia della lingua e dei dialetti italiani* (Bologne, 1982), pp.115–19. See also R.I. Blachake, 'Hē diathēkē tēs Agnes korēs tou Alexiou Kallergē (1331) kai ho orthodoxos episkopos Makarios', in *Pepragmena tou E' diethnous krētologikou synedriou*, (= Proceedings of the Fifth International Cretological Congress) (Heraklion, 1985), Vol. 2, pp.56–8.
 22. See Oikonomides, 'La décomposition de l'empire byzantin', pp.3–22, especially pp.11–12, 22.
 23. For the Morea, see J. Longnon (ed.), *Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée: Chronique de Morée (1204–1305)* (Paris, 1911), paras. 106–7, 120, and J. Schmitt (ed.), *The Chronicle of Morea: Chronikon tou Moreos* (London, 1904), vv. 1641–50, 1830–35. On the circumstances, see Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.430–32, 441–2; for Negroponte, see T Th, Vol. 2, p.95; also Jacoby, *La féodalité*, p.188. Latin lords nevertheless confiscated the estates of *archontes*.
 24. See Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.17–18, especially n.26, and pp.27–30, 109–10, 124–5, and Jacoby, *La féodalité*, p.225, respectively.
 25. See some earlier cases in D.A. Xanatalos, *Beiträge zur Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte Makedoniens im Mittelalter, hauptsächlich auf Grund der Briefe des Erzbischofs Theophylaktos von Achrida* (Munich, 1937), pp.54–5. It is noteworthy that in the Morea the testimony of villeins was admitted in court in cases concerning land and its boundaries: G. Recoura (ed.), *Les Assises de Romanie: édition critique avec une introduction et des notes* (Paris, 1930), p.270, para. 175.
 26. Text in F. Thiriet, *Délibérations des assemblées vénitiennes concernant la Romanie* (Paris, 1966–71), Vol. 1, p.297, No. 254 (22 Feb. 1312).
 27. On the Byzantine cadastral registers and the *praktika* referred to below, see N.G. Svoronos, 'Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin et la fiscalité aux XI^e et XII^e siècles: le cadastre de Thèbes', *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, 83 (1959), 19–33, 57–67 (also published separately), and the review by J. Karayannopoulos in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 56 (1963), especially 363–6. On the late Byzantine *praktika*, see A.E. Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society in the Late Byzantine Empire: A Social and Demographic Study* (Princeton, 1977), pp.8–13. On the twelfth-century *anagrapheus*, see Herrin, 'Realities', pp.271–2.
 28. R. Cessi and P. Sambin (eds.), *Le deliberazioni del Consiglio dei Rogati (Senato), Serie mixtorum*, Vol. 1, (Venice, 1960), p.190, Reg. 5, No. 160: *Reducantur catastica in linguam latinam*. On the importance of these registers in Venetian Messenia, see D. Jacoby, 'Un aspect de la fiscalité vénitienne dans le Péloponnèse aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles: le "zovaticum"', *Travaux et mémoires*, 1 (1965), 407–9, repr. in id., *Société et démographie*, No. IV; also Ch. Hodgetts, 'Land Problems in Coron 1298–1347: A Contribution on Venetian Colonial Rule', *Byzantina*, 12 (1983), 149–50, 152. On the village elders, see n.79 below.
 29. See E. Gerland, *Das Archiv des Herzogs von Kandia im königlichen Staatsarchiv zu Venedig* (Strasburg, 1899), pp.19–23, and Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, p.7, and pp.143–54, for excerpts of such *catastica*; Z.N. Tsirpanlēs, 'Katasticho

- ekklēsiōn kai monastēriōn tou koinou (1248–1548)', *Symbolē stē meletē tōn scheseōn Politeias kai Ekklēsias stē benetokratoumenē Krētē* (Ioannina, 1985). The listing of measurements in the *catasticum* is illustrated by documents dated 1317 and 1318 referring to the surface area of a plot of land situated in the city of Candia and belonging to a military tenement: Sp. M. Theotokēs (ed.), *Historika krētika eggrapha: Apophaseis meizonos symboulion Benetias, 1255–1689* (*Mnēmēia tēs hellenikēs historias, A/II*) (Athens, 1933), pp.90–1, No. 39, and p.96, No. 48. In 1309 the Venetian Minor Council agreed to the request submitted by the holder of a military tenement in Crete that his dependent peasants should be registered in the *catasticum* of the Commune: G. Giomo (ed.), 'Lettere segrete del Collegio, *rectius* Minor Consiglio', in *R. Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie*, 3rd ser., 1 (1910), *Miscellanea di storia veneta*, No. 201; see also D. Jacoby, 'Une classe fiscale à Byzance et en Romanie latine: les inconnus du fisc, éleuthères ou étrangers', *Actes du XIV^e Congrès international des études byzantines* (Bucarest, 1971), II (Bucharest, 1975), (hereafter *CIEB*, 14) pp.141–2, 149, repr. in id., *Recherches*, No.III.
30. See Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.433, 449–50; id., *La féodalité*, pp.53–5.
 31. J. Longnon and P. Topping (eds.), *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIV^e siècle* (Paris and The Hague, 1969) (hereafter LT), p.21, ll. 11–12, and p.33, ll. 8–9 for Cutrullus and Murmurus; see also Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 895, 900, 902–3. On the *protovestiarius*, see P. Topping, *Feudal Institutions as Revealed in the Assizes of Romania, the Law Code of Frankish Greece* (Philadelphia, 1949), pp.123–4, repr. with some corrections in id., *Studies on Latin Greece A.D. 1205–1715* (London, 1977), No. I; on the Byzantine officer, see Herrin, 'Realities', 273.
 32. Published by LT, pp.19–215.
 33. See n.27 above.
 34. LT, p.52, ll. 14–15, 17, and see also p.164, ll. 5–6 (1365).
 35. LT, p.147, l. 9, and see the summary preceding this report on pp.141–4. Yet one may wonder whether Nicola compiled the Greek survey by himself or merely supervised its drafting.
 36. Th. St. Tzannetatos (ed.), *To praktikon tēs latinikēs episkopēs Kephallēnias tou 1264 kai hē epitomē autou* (Athens, 1965). See also the extensive review by N. Panayiotakis in *Epetēris hetaireias byzantinōn spoudōn*, 34 (1965), pp.372–84.
 37. Edition, dating, and commentary by E. Granstrem, *et al.* 'Fragment d'un *praktikon* de la région d'Athènes (avant 1204)', *Revue des études byzantines*, 34 (1976), 5–44. For the dating of the script, see 5–6, 8. The editors were not aware that *praktika* were still compiled in Greek after the Latin conquest, hence their attribution of the original survey to the twelfth century, which is not convincing. The consecutive Latin numerals point to an orderly transcription of the data, and not to a disorganized manuscript as claimed by the editors (p.7). Their inscription on the *verso* of the two surviving folios is nevertheless puzzling.
 38. See the list of dukes and rectors of Crete from 1208 to 1310, compiled by Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.127–31; for Coron and Modon, see Ch. Hopf, *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin, 1873), pp.378–9; for Negroponte, see *ibid.*, pp.371–2.
 39. So did, incidentally, the recent editors of this text: LT, p.135, l. 33. In all the known Byzantine *praktika* there is only one instance of a child explicitly mentioned as a nursing baby: J. Lefort (ed.), *Actes d'Esphigménou* (*Archives de l'Athos*, Vol. 6) (Paris, 1973), p.65, No. 7, ll. 3–4. Yet others may have been recorded without being mentioned as such: see D. Jacoby, 'Phénomènes de démographie rurale à Byzance aux XIII^e, XIV^e et XV^e siècles', *Etudes rurales*, 5–6 (1962), 166–7, repr. in id., *Société et démographie*, No. III.
 40. For these words, see *Index rerum* in LT, pp.312–24; s.v. *ambellonia*, *brivilegio*, *vestia*, and in the *Index nominum*, pp.284–309, s.v. *Bauldi Calami*, *Blacchus* and *Vlacchus*, *Mabrobodi* and *Mabroponte*. Another illustration of the oral testimony or written model in Greek is provided by the following, p.72, l. 14, and see l. 27:

- stasia* (= fiscal unit) *tu* (= the Greek *tou*) *Chinu*, instead of the Latin *de*.
41. See Jacoby, 'Un aspect', p.406.
 42. See P. Topping, 'Viticulture in Venetian Crete (XIIIth C.)', in *Pepragmena tou D' diethnous krētologikou synedriou* (Heraklion, 1976, Athens, 1981), Vol. 2, pp.509–20, and especially the glossary on pp.519–20.
 43. Marino Sanudo Torsello, *Istoria del Regno di Romania*, fol. 1v, in Hopf, *Chroniques*, p.100.
 44. Text in LT, p.162, ll. 3–7, and commentary pp.275–6. See also S.B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204–1453* (n.p., 1985), pp.84–5, 118, yet my interpretation partly differs. The tax on imports and exports appears in 1261 on the island of Negroponte as *comerclum maris*: see Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.192–3; also Borsari, *Studi*, p.128, n. 71. The similar *dirictus commercii vel dohane* is attested in Clarence in 1294: Ch. Perrat and J. Longnon (eds.), *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée, 1289–1300* (Paris, 1967), p.97, No. 94. See also Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, p.231. On the Byzantine *komerktion*, see H. Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Recherches sur les douanes à byzance* (Paris, 1963), and the important review of this work by P. Lemerle in *Revue historique*, 232 (1964), 225–31.
 45. LT, p.162, ll. 8–25. The *chomerchio del mercato* must be identical with the *chomerchio* on commercial transactions within the principality of the Morea, mentioned in the *Assizes of Romania*: Recoura, *Les Assises de Romanie* (Paris, 1930), pp.255–6, para. 152, and see Jacoby, *La féodalité*, p.56.
 46. See Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, p.230, and D. Jacoby, 'Venice, the Inquisition and the Jewish Communities of Crete in the Early 14th Century', *Studi veneziani*, 12 (1970), 130–32, repr. in id., *Recherches*, No. IX.
 47. LT, p.63, l. 17; p.82, l. 6; p.83, l. 13. On this tax and its Byzantine prototype, see *ibid.*, p.63, n. 20, and Antoniadis-Bibicou, *Recherches sur les douanes*, pp.123, 134.
 48. On such cases, see also Jacoby, 'Un aspect', pp.418–20.
 49. Some of them have already been mentioned above, pp.14–15. For these and others, see the extensive commentary in LT, pp.268–75; Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, p.225 (yet on the *zovaticum* and *zeugaratikion*, see below); Jacoby, *La féodalité*, p.351, Index of technical terms. The dispositions of the treaty of 1219 between Venice and some Cretan *archontes* about taxes and labour services imposed on the *villani* seem to reflect those owed by the latter's ancestors prior to 1204, with one major difference: some of the military tenements held by Latins in 1219 may have previously been state land, in which case the *paroikoi* would have provided taxes and services to the imperial fisc; for these dispositions, see T Th, Vol. 2, p.212.
 50. See R.L. Wolff, 'Politics in the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 8 (1954), pp.267–74, especially 268; also the letter of Pope Honorius III, *ibid.*, 298–301, especially 299; repr. in id., *Studies in the Latin Empire of Constantinople* (London, 1976), No. IX. The partial exemption for all rural priests covers *angarie*, *perangerie*, *exactiones* and *talie*, rather imprecise terms inherited from the empire, yet definitely pointing to former state dues and labour services: see, for example, the *angaria de castellis* in the *praktikon* of 1219 for Lampsakos, where this obligation was commuted for a cash payment: new edition by A. Carile, 'La signoria rurale nell' impero latino di Costantinopoli (1204–1261)', *CIEB*, 15, Vol. 4 (Athens, 1980), p.77; also the *angaria* for the maintenance of the castle of Hagios Nikolaos in Crete, mentioned in a corrupted form (*in aquariis*) in 1234–35: T Th, Vol. 2, p.327; for the dating, see Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, p.44, n. 50. On public dues and services, see also nn. 67–8 below.
 51. On the whole issue, see N. Svoronos, 'Les privilèges de l'Eglise à l'époque des Comnènes: un rescrit inédit de Manuel 1^{er} Comnène', *Travaux et mémoires*, 1 (1965), 356–60. On special taxes and exactions, see id., 'Recherches sur le cadastre byzantin', pp.81–3, 93–7. On the *demosiakē epereia*, see also P. Lemerle, *The Agrarian History of Byzantium from the Origins to the Twelfth Century* (Galway, 1979), pp.167–8, 174, 208, and for service in the fleet or the army, pp.143 and 147;

- on the *ploimon* in the twelfth century, then a regular tax for the outfitting of the navy included among these obligations, see H. Glykatzi, *Byzance et la mer. La marine de guerre, la politique et les institutions maritimes de Byzance aux VII^e-XV^e siècles* (Paris, 1966), p.212 (and n.3), 276, 278; see also n.68 below.
52. For what follows, see Jacoby, 'Un aspect', pp.405-20. Yet on the derivation of the term *zovadego*, see K. Ntokos, 'Zovaticum', *Mnēmē*, 1 (1971), pp.175-96, especially 180-84, 187-9.
 53. See Jacoby, 'Un aspect', p.408. On the administration of the two districts in the thirteenth century, see Borsari, *Studi*, pp.96-8.
 54. On which see the new edition of a crucial text by A. Carile, 'Partitio terrarum Imperii Romanie', *Studi veneziani*, 7 (1965), 219, ll. 57-62, and commentary by A. Bon, *Le Péloponnèse byzantin jusqu'en 1204* (Paris, 1951), pp.100-102; Glykatzi, *Byzance et la mer*, pp.277-8; Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.423-6.
 55. For the Morea, for instance, see Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.29-74.
 56. A particularly revealing, though somewhat exceptional case is mentioned in the agreement of 1234-35 between Venice and two Cretan *archontes*: T Th, Vol. 2, p.327. The Venetian castellan of Hagios Nikolaos was to obtain the agreement of these Greeks in order to exercise jurisdiction; this supposes the transmission of information on Byzantine law and procedure.
 57. See Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.75-82.
 58. Ibid., pp.32-6, and Jacoby, 'Les archontes', p.451-9.
 59. See Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.36-7; K. Mertzios, 'Hē synthēkē Eneton-Kallergē kai hoi synodeuontes autēn katalogoi', *Krētika chronika*, 3 (1949), 272, para. 27; Topping, 'Viticulture', pp.510-17; Hodgetts, 'Land Problems', 140-41, and the document on 154-5.
 60. These sources are discussed on pp.20-23 below.
 61. For a convenient summary of issues raised in the *Assizes*, see Topping, *Feudal Institutions*, pp.103-77, and different interpretations in Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.445-76; id., *La féodalité*, pp.29-74, and see also the index, ibid., pp.353-6, for individual assizes.
 62. See Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.455-9, 475-6, and see n.58 above.
 63. On the evolution in Crete in particular, see Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, pp.235-43. On the general principles guiding the Venetian government in the preservation of local custom or law and the application of Venetian law, see Jacoby, *La féodalité*, pp.295-9.
 64. On the rebellions, see above, pp.8-9, and on the Greek notaries, see Hodgetts, 'Land Problems', 149-51.
 65. See Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.185-9. On legal freedom in Byzantium with respect to the *paroikoi*, see G. Weiss, 'Formen von Unfreiheit in Byzantium im 14. Jahrhundert', *CIEB*, 14, pp.291-5; see also the studies by Weiss and Oikonomides cited in n. 69 below. On the attitudes to freedom, see P. Gauthier (ed.), *Theophylacte d'Achrida. Lettres* (Salonika, 1986), p.485, ll. 26-9; A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, 'Ioannes Apokaukos kai Niketas Choniates', *Tessarakontaeteris tēs kathēgēsias K.S. Kontou* (Athens, 1909), pp.379ff., was not accessible to me, but see the summary by Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec*, Vol. 2, p.204, n. 6. For a different view on the *paroikoi* and their economic standing, see the studies of K.V. Hostova, mentioned and conveniently summarized by I. Sorlin, 'Bulletin des publications en langues slaves: les recherches soviétiques sur l'histoire byzantine. IV. 1978-1985', *Travaux et mémoires*, 10 (1987), 494-9.
 66. On the status and the numerous restrictions imposed on the *villani*, including state villeins, see Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.207-14; on Venetian Messenia and especially the state villeins, see also id., 'Un aspect', pp.417-18, and Hodgetts, 'Land Problems', 142-53. The hereditary condition of the *paroikos* in Latin Romania is also illustrated by the survey compiled in 1264 in the island of Cephalonia: Tzannetatos, *To praktikon*, p.68, ll. 588-9. This document is not relevant for the Byzantine *paroikos*, as assumed by Weiss, 'Formen von Unfreiheit', p.293 and n. 12, who cites an older edition of this text. On the

- opposing views expressed about the existence of a free Greek peasantry, see Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.185–6; on free peasants in Latin Romania, see Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.41–2.
67. See Jacoby, 'Un aspect', pp.410, 415, 417–20.
 68. On the public *angaria* for the castle of Hagios Nikolaos in Crete, see n.50 above. On maritime service in particular, see *ibid.*, pp.410–11, and Jacoby, 'Les gens de mer dans la marine de guerre vénitienne de la mer Egée aux XIV^e et XV^e siècles', in R. Ragosta (ed.), *Le genti del mare Mediterraneo* [= XVII Colloquio internazionale di storia marittima, Napoli, 1980] (Naples, 1981), Vol. 1, pp.169–201; on Coron and Modon, see also Hodgetts, 'Land Problems', 142; on Rhodes, see A. Luttrell, 'The *servitudo marina* at Rhodes: 1306–1462', in *Serta Neograeca*, ed. K. Dimaras and P. Wirth (Amsterdam, 1975), pp.50–65, repr. in *id.*, *The Hospitallers in Cyprus, Rhodes and the West, 1291–1440* (London, 1978), No. IV; also *id.*, 'Medieval Rhodes', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 11 (1987), 363, 374. On naval service and taxes in the Byzantine period, see Herrin, 'Realities', 275, 278–9.
 69. See Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.208–9. On the thirty-year Byzantine prescription regarding property, see Weiss, 'Die Entscheidung des Kosmas Magistros über das Parökenrecht. Ein Beitrag zur Rechtsgrundlage bäuerlicher Ansiedlungen in Byzanz', *Byzantion*, 48 (1978), 477–500, and N. Oikonomides, 'Hē "Peira" peri paroikōn', in B. Kremmydas, *et al.* (eds.), *Aphierōma stōn Niko Svoronos* (Rethymnon, 1986), Vol. 1, pp.236–41.
 70. See Jacoby, 'Une classe fiscale', pp.139–52. It is noteworthy that in 1307 the Greek monastery of St John on Patmos received permission from the Venetian government to settle 38 villeins ransomed from pirates on its own land in Crete: F. Miklosich und J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata medii aevi sacra et profana* (Vienna, 1860–90), Vol. 6, pp.389–90 (Greek version on p.221). These villeins were in fact *eleutheroi* and as such state villeins. They remained so afterwards, as illustrated by the obligation of the monastery to pay the state an annual sum of one *hyperpyron* for each of them; this was the *villanazio*, imposed on state villeins: see Jacoby, 'Les états latins', p.38, and *id.*, 'Social Evolution', pp.210, 213.
 71. Sources in Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, p.91, and nn. 110–11.
 72. The detection of minors in some Byzantine *praktika* (see n. 39 above) raises the question whether all of them were registered, or whether this was only the case with *paroikoi* having attained legal majority. It should be noted that the registration of women in these documents was unsystematic: see Jacoby, 'Phénomènes de démographie rurale', 164–71. Exactly the same features characterize the Moreot *praktika*. I am therefore unable to share Laiou's conviction that the Byzantine documents reflect the real distribution of the peasant population in terms of sex and age, nor can I accept her calculations as presented in Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society*, especially pp.267–98.
 73. For Byzantium, see *ibid.*, pp.223–98. There is no similar, exhaustive study on the Moreot peasantry, yet a perusal of the sources provides the same general impression. A. Carile, *La rendita feudale nella Morea latina del XIV secolo* (Bologna, 1974), deals with the society, economy, and demography of the Principality, yet many of his conclusions have to be rejected on methodological grounds, and this is also the case with his treatment of social categories in the Morea; see also A. Carile, 'Rapporti fra signoria rurale e "Despoteia" alla luce della formazione della rendita feudale nella Morea latina del secolo XIV', *Rivista storica italiana*, 88 (1976), pp.554–5. See my extensive review in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 73 (1980), 356–61, especially 358–9.
 74. See, for example, Jacoby 'Un régime de coseigneurie', pp.111–25, especially 121–3.
 75. See *ibid.*, pp.117–20; my review cited in n.73 above, 358; Jacoby, 'Une classe fiscale', pp.140–43, 145, 151–2; Hodgetts, 'Land Problems', 147.
 76. For the Morea, see my review cited in n. 73 above, 358–9.
 77. See Jacoby, 'Les gens de mer', pp.182–4, and p.198 on the escape to Asia Minor.

78. On Byzantium, see Laiou-Thomadakis, *Peasant Society*, pp.24–66.
79. On the Morea, see LT, p.66, *l.* 9; p.102, *ll.* 2–4; p.113, *ll.* 15–17; pp.262–3; on Messenia, see Jacoby, 'Un aspect', pp.413–14, and on representatives of the *villani*, pp.409–10; Hodgetts 'Land Problems', 149–53; Thiriet, *La Romanie vénitienne*, pp.286–7.
80. Among the numerous studies on this subject, the following are especially relevant here: R.L. Wolff, 'The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, 1204–1261: Social and Administrative Consequences of the Latin Conquest', *Traditio*, 6 (1948), 33–60; id., 'Politics in the Latin Patriarchate', pp.228–303; both repr. in id., *Studies*, Nos. VIII and IX. The most recent contribution on this subject is by J. Richard, 'The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople (1204–1227)' in this volume. On the friars, see R.L. Wolff, 'The Latin Empire of Constantinople and the Franciscans', *Traditio*, 2 (1944), 213–37, repr. in id., *Studies*, No. VI; E.A. Brown, 'The Cistercians in the Latin Empire of Constantinople and Greece, 1204–1276', *Traditio*, 14 (1958), 63–120; B.M. Bolton, 'A Mission to the Orthodox? The Cistercians in Romania', in *Studies in Church History*, Vol. 13: *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, ed. D. Baker (Oxford, 1976), pp.169–81; also M. Angold, 'Greeks and Latins after 1204: The Perspective of Exile', in this volume; Bon, *La Morée franque*, pp.89–102, and on the Athenian Church, K.M. Setton, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*, Vol. 1, *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Philadelphia, 1976), pp.405–17. On Venetian religious policy in general, see Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.62–4, 106–25; id., *Studi*, pp.99–105; G. Fedalto, *La chiesa latina in Oriente*, Vol. 1 (2nd revd. edn., Verona, 1981), pp.377–448, and Vol. 3. (Verona, 1978), pp.9–24; F. Thiriet, 'La symbiose dans les états latins formés sur les territoires de la Romania byzantine (1202 à 1261): phénomènes religieux', *CIEB*, 15, 1/3, pp.26–35, and his 'Eglises, fidèles et clergés en Crète vénitienne (de la conquête, 1204/1211 au XV^e siècle)', *Pepragmena* (see n.42 above), Vol. 2, pp.484–500; Zakythinos, *Le despotat grec*, Vol. 2, pp.275–6, and the additional bibliography in the appendix. For a general view, see Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.205–6, 218–20.
81. See, for instance, the Venetian opposition to the activities of a Dominican inquisitor in Crete: Jacoby, 'Venice, the Inquisition and the Jewish Communities', 127–44.
82. See p.6 above.
83. See, for example, n.18 above.
84. See n.50 above. The agreement of 1299 between Venice and Alexius Kallergis mentions *papates* and *diaconi* who were not villeins: Mertzios, 'Hē synthēkē', p.271, para. 18.
85. See Jacoby, 'Les états latins', 29; Blachake, 'Hē diathēkē tēs Agnes korēs tou Alexiou Kallergē (1331)', pp.58–62.
86. Sanudo, *Istoria*, fol. 15v. in Hopf, *Chroniques*, p.143, and see also Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 890, n.75.
87. See Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.205, 220–21.
88. See T.H. Gouma-Peterson, 'Manuel and John Phokas and Artistic Personality in Late Byzantine Painting', *Gesta*, 22 (1983), 160–61.
89. On these inscriptions, see Jacoby, 'The Encounter', 898, and Koder, *Negroponte* (n.14 above). For Moreot inscriptions not mentioning the emperors, see D. Feissel and A. Philippidis-Braat, 'Inventaires en vue d'un recueil des inscriptions historiques de Byzance. III. Inscriptions du Péloponnèse (à l'exception de Mistra)', *Travaux et mémoires*, 9 (1985), 311, No. 54 (1244/45), and 335–6, No. 74 (mid-fourteenth century?).
90. For what follows, see Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.205–6, 218–20.
91. The Cistercians' loss of most of their monasteries by 1276 is significant; see Brown, 'The Cistercians in the Latin Empire', and Bolton, 'A Mission' (n.80 above).
92. See C.D. Sheppard, 'Excavations at the Cathedral of Haghia Sophia, Andravida, Greece', *Gesta*, 25 (1986), pp.139–44, on the church of the princes of Morea; Bon,

- La Morée franque*, pp.537–47, 553–99; B.K. Panagopoulos, *Cistercian and Mendicant Monasteries in Medieval Greece* (Chicago, 1979), pp.25–111, 127–42; Koder, *Negroponte*, pp.164–7.
93. On Melos, see Wolff, 'The Organization of the Latin Patriarchate', p.43; for a general view, see Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', pp.205–6, 218–221, id., 'Les états latins', pp.21–2. On the knowledge of Greek among Latins, see A.E. Laiou-Thomadakis, 'The Greek Merchant of the Paleologian Period: A Collective Portrait', *Praktika tēs Akademias Athenōn*, 57 (1982), 121–3; A.E. Laiou, 'Quelques observations sur l'économie et la société de Crète vénitienne (ca.1270–ca.1305)', in *Bisanzio e l'Italia. Raccolta di studi in memoria di Agostino Pertusi* (Milan, 1982), pp.197–8; A.E. Laiou, 'Observations on the Results of the Fourth Crusade: Greeks and Latins in Port and Market', *Medievalia et humanistica*, NS, 12 (1984), 53–4. According to the French and Greek versions of the *Chronicle of Morea* (Longnon, *Livre de la conqueste*, para. 308, and Schmitt, *The Chronicle of Morea*, verse 4130), William II of Villehardouin, prince of Morea, spoke fluent Greek, yet the fact that this was stressed proves that it was not the rule.
 94. For what follows, see M.F. Hendy, *Studies in the Byzantine Monetary Economy, c.300–1450* (Cambridge, 1985), pp.44–58, 69–90, 513–19, 561–602; Kazhdan and Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, pp.24–62; M. Angold, 'The Shaping of the Medieval Byzantine "City"', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 10 (1985), 1–39, especially 18–28; id., 'Archons and Dynasts: Local Aristocracies and the Cities of the Later Byzantine Empire', in Angold, *The Byzantine Aristocracy*, pp.236–53.
 95. See respectively Jacoby, 'Les archontes', pp.422–6; see n.14 above on Negroponte; Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.13–20; Jacoby, 'Social Evolution', p.181; P. Karlin-Hayter, 'Notes sur les archives de Patmos comme source pour la démographie et l'économie de l'île', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 5 (1977), 198–210, 214–15.
 96. See n.94 above, and Karlin-Hayter, 'Notes sur les archives de Patmos', 198–210, 214–15; N.Svoronos, 'Remarques sur les structures économiques de l'empire byzantin au XI^e siècle', *Travaux et mémoires*, 6 (1976), pp.51–60, and n.114 below; Malamut, 'Les îles de la mer Egée', 310–28.
 97. See G. Stadtmüller, 'Michael Choniates, Metropolit von Athen', *Orientalia christiana*, 33/2 (1934), 154–60, 167–78. This generalized depiction is usually accepted as truthful.
 98. On urban property, see Svoronos, 'Remarques', 65, and Angold, 'Archons and Dynasts', pp.239–40; on revenues accruing from official functions and dignities, see Svoronos, 'Remarques', pp.59–60, n.35, and p.62; Kazhdan and Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture*, p.58.
 99. On which see Hendy, *Studies*, pp.565–9.
 100. See Svoronos, 'Remarques', pp.61–2, on investments by the monastery of Lavra. On St John of Patmos, see Karlin-Hayter, as n.95 above, and Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.121–3.
 101. The production of silken cloth in Euboea before the conquest is implied by documents dated 1209 and 1216: T Th, Vol. 2, pp.90, 93, 181. It seems to me that generalizations are not warranted, especially for other areas later included in Latin Romania, such as Crete, for which few sources on urban development have survived.
 102. On the role of the *archontes* in the urban economy of continental Greece, see Angold, 'Archons and Dynasts', pp.236–41; id., 'The Shaping of the Medieval Byzantine "City"', 22–5; Hendy, *Studies*, pp.85–90; Svoronos, 'Remarques', pp.65–7, who argues (pp. 61–2) that *archontes* only were capable of investments, but these were restricted to short periods and to the initial stage of business ventures.
 103. On fairs, see n.119 below: the Greek term *panegyris* was maintained under Latin rule. On distant markets, see P. Lemerle, 'Notes sur l'administration byzantine à la veille de la IV^e croisade d'après deux documents inédits des archives de Lavra',

- Revue des études byzantines*, 19 (1961), pp.258–72; Svoronos, 'Remarques', pp.65–7; Karlin-Hayter, 'Notes', pp.210–14; Hendy, *Studies*, pp.567, 591. On the dominance of Constantinople in this context, see *ibid.*, pp.51–4, 561–2.
104. Recently again: see Angold, 'The Shaping of the Medieval Byzantine "City"', 25–8, 32–4, 37. For a different approach, see M.F. Hendy, 'Byzantium, 1081–1204: An Economic Reappraisal', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 5th ser., 20 (1970), 31–52, and with particular reference to the West, Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.42–3.
 105. See R.-J. Lilie, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)* (Amsterdam, 1984), especially pp.117–324. There are also sources not used by this author; for example, on Cretan cheese exported to Alexandria, see S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society: The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Vol. 1 (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967), pp.46, 124.
 106. Elsewhere the process of urbanization was even more limited in scope and not necessarily related to Italian trade: see Malamut, 'Les îles de la mer Egée', 328–39, and n.107 below.
 107. See Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.42–3.
 108. For what follows, see Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.42–8, and *id.*, 'Social Evolution', 216–18; Borsari, *Il dominio veneziano*, pp.67–87; *id.*, *Studi*, pp.123–32, and the studies of Laiou cited in n.120 below. I shall deal with this subject in more detail in a forthcoming study.
 109. On which see pp.10–23 above.
 110. The financial power of the *archontes* also declined after the loss of their revenues deriving from urban assets, offices and dignities, on which see n.98 above. On the predominantly urban settlement of the Latins, see Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.19–22, 45–7. The Greeks are obviously under-represented in the sources of Latin Romania.
 111. For a general view of this interaction in the West, see G. Duby, *Rural Economy and Country Life in the Medieval West* (Columbia, SC, 1968), pp.126–65, 279–89.
 112. Loans repaid in agricultural products and profit-sharing ventures are abundantly documented by Venetian notarial sources and Moreot *praktika*: see among others Topping, 'Viticulture', pp.510–18; Jacoby's review mentioned in n.73 above, 360–61; Laiou, 'Quelques observations', pp.177–98.
 113. See nn.108 and 112 above; my reviews mentioned in n.114 below W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au Moyen-Age* (Paris, 1885–86), Vol. 1, pp.272, 279–80; A. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge* (Munich and Berlin, 1906), pp.264, 266; for the first half of the fourteenth century in particular, see Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans (Cambridge, MA, 1936), pp.24–5, 39–40, 93, 104, 117, 143, 145, 149, 157, 159, 198. On tanning, see n.116 below.
 114. On the structure and revenues of these estates, see P. Topping, 'Le régime agraire dans le Péloponnèse latin au XIV^e siècle', *L'Hellénisme contemporain*, 2nd ser., 10 (1956), repr. in the author's *Studies on Latin Greece*, No. III; Carile, 'Rapporti fra signoria rurale e "Despoteia"', pp.548–68; also my review mentioned above, n.73, 359–61, and another of LT in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 69 (1976), 91.
 115. See Jacoby, 'Les états latins', pp.44–5. Although Latin Romania exported wheat, there is also evidence for its importation to this area in years of dearth: see, for example, E.A. Zachariadou, 'Prix et marchés des céréales en Roumanie (1343–1405)', *Nuova rivista storica*, 61 (1977), 291–305, repr. in *id.*, *Romania and the Turks (c.1300–c.1500)* (London, 1985), No. IX. On piracy, see Thiriet, *La Roumanie, vénitienne*, p.243–56; P. Charanis, 'Piracy in the Aegean during the Reign of Michael VIII Palaeologus', *Annuaire de l'Institut de Philologie et d'Histoire Orientales et Slaves*, 10 (1950), 127–36; G. Morgan, 'The Venetian

- Claims Commission of 1278', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 69 (1976), 411–38; A.E. Laiou, *Constantinople and the Latins: The Foreign Policy of Andronicus II, 1281–1328* (Cambridge, MA, 1972), Index, s.v. piracy; E.A. Zachariadou, *Trade and Crusade: Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415)* (Venice, 1983), *passim*; I.B. Katele, 'Piracy and the Venetian State: The Dilemma of Maritime Defense in the Fourteenth Century', *Speculum*, 63 (1988), 865–89.
116. There were many Jewish tanners: see D. Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews in the Eastern Mediterranean', in *Gli Ebrei e Venezia (secoli XIV–XVIII)* (Venice, 1987), pp.47–8. On the export of silk and kermes, see Heyd, *Histoire*, Vol. 1, pp.272, 279, and Vol. 2, pp.282, 295–6, 607–9; Pegolotti, *La pratica*, pp.119, 145, 149, 159, 198, 208, 297; on a large amount of silk from Negroponte to Venice, see Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews', p.56, n.71. On silken cloth, see Heyd, *Histoire*, Vol. 2, pp.295–6, 699–700; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp.265–6; Jacoby, 'Venice and the Venetian Jews', 48; the Hebrew document of c.1330 providing the evidence has been translated by Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium*, especially p.235, and see commentary on pp.238 and 240 for the dating. See also Pegolotti, *La pratica*, p.145; on Moreot samit, Carile, *La rendita feudale*, p.18; on Cretan samit, P. Ratti-Vidulich (ed.), *Duca di Candia. Bandi (1313–1329)* (Venice, 1965), p.15, No. 27 (April 1314), and Theotokis, *Thespismata*, Vol. 1, p.225 (July 1342).
117. See A.E. Laiou, 'Venice as a Center of Trade and of Artistic Production in the Thirteenth Century', in H. Belting (ed.), *Il Medio Oriente e l'Occidente nell'arte del XIII Secolo [= Atti del XXIV Congresso internazionale di storia dell'arte, (Bologna, 1975)]* Vol. 2 (Bologna, 1982), pp.14–15, 18–19.
118. See Jacoby, 'Les états latins', p.45, and n.44 above for Corinth in 1365; also Carile, *La rendita feudale*, pp.28–9. Around 1210 the revenue accruing from the *commerchium* of this city was undoubtedly larger than the 400 *hyperpyra* granted by Prince Geoffrey I, on which see n.43 above. H. Saranti-Mendelovici, 'A propos de la ville de Patras aux 13^e–15^e siècles', *Revue des études byzantines*, 38 (1980), 219–32, is insufficiently documented.
119. See Longnon, *Livre de la Conquête*, paras. 802–3; LT, p.274.
120. See Laiou, 'Quelques observations', pp.180–82, 188, 194–7; id., 'Observations on the Results of the Fourth Crusade', pp.50–54; Laiou-Thomadakis, 'The Greek Merchant', especially 115–23; id., 'The Byzantine Economy in the Mediterranean Trade System: Thirteenth-Fifteenth Centuries', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 34–5 (1980–81), 177–222. On regional trade in the Morea, see n.119 above, and Pegolotti, *La pratica*, pp.116–19.
121. See my forthcoming study mentioned in n.108 above. On coinage, see A.M. Stahl, 'Venetian Coinage in Medieval Greece', *Actes du II^e Colloque international d'histoire: Economies méditerranéennes; équilibres et intercommunications* (Athens, 1985), pp.365–9; id., *The Venetian Tornese: a Medieval Colonial Coinage*, American Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 163 (New York, 1985).

Italian Migration and Settlement in Latin Greece: The Impact on the Economy

The Fourth Crusade, which ended with the conquest of Constantinople in 1204, generated important developments in three closely related fields. First, it furthered and hastened the political and territorial fragmentation of Byzantium, initiated some twenty-five years earlier, and led to the establishment of new political entities in the territories conquered by the Latins. Latin demographic expansion into this region was yet another outgrowth of the Fourth Crusade. The conquest opened the way to Latin migration and settlement on a scale and along patterns unknown before in the Byzantine lands or Romania. The volume and effects of these processes were particularly pronounced in the former western territories of the Byzantine Empire, some of which remained for more than two centuries under Latin rule. The Italians had a major share in both migration and settlement and contributed decisively to the long-term economic evolution of western Romania, which is the third field that warrants our attention. The interaction between migration, settlement and economic development is particularly well documented for some areas of Latin Greece in the period extending from the early thirteenth century to about 1390, on which we shall focus. Yet the nature and impact of this interaction can only be understood in the wider context of the Eastern Mediterranean, to which frequent references will be made.

A brief survey of political developments in the region of Latin Greece with which we are concerned is essential for an understanding of the processes we are about to examine. Beginning in 1205 French and Italian knights occupied the Peloponnese, Attica, Boeotia and the island of Euboea or Negroponte. The largest and most important among the new states they founded was Frankish Morea, which for a short period of fourteen years only, from 1248 to 1262, covered almost the entire Peloponnese. In 1262, however, Byzantium regained a foothold in the peninsula, and its continuous pressure induced Prince William II of Villehardouin to seek in 1267 the support of Charles I of Anjou, King of Sicily. Following William's death in 1278 the principality came under the rule of Charles I and was administered by his officials, those of his successors and those of the princes of the Morea, two of whom only resided for short periods in the Peloponnese. In 1376 or 1377 the Order of the Hospitallers leased Frankish Morea for five years from Queen Joanna of Naples, and a few years later Angevin rule in the principality

collapsed¹. Venice was the third power present in the Peloponnese. It was undoubtedly the main beneficiary of the Fourth Crusade, which enabled the foundation of its colonial empire. From 1207 to 1500 Venice held the ports of Modon and Coron and their rural areas in the southwest of the peninsula, and in 1388 it acquired Nauplia, Argos and their rural territories, occupying the former city in the following year and the latter in 1394². Venice's most important colony overseas was Crete³. Outside the Peloponnese the lordship of Athens, which extended over Attica and Boeotia, was governed by its Frankish lords until 1311, when it was conquered by the so-called Catalan Company that ruled it for about seventy years⁴. The island of Euboea or Negroponte was divided into three main feudal units, except from 1208 to 1216. In 1211 Venice obtained a quarter in the city of Negroponte, the capital of the island. In the following century it progressively extended its rule from this outpost to the whole of Euboea and some islands of the Aegean, which were in Latin hands since shortly after the Fourth Crusade. This second stage of Venetian expansion was completed by 1390⁵.

The origin of the conquerors, the political regime they established in their new territories and, finally, the political ties of the latter with western powers had a strong bearing on the nature, composition and distribution of Latin migration and settlement in Greece in the two centuries following the Fourth Crusade. After 1204 the knights within the conquering armies provided the first nuclei of settlers in continental Greece and islands in its vicinity. They were later joined by their kinsmen and other members of the knightly class from their lands of origin. The majority of these settlers hailed from Capetian France and neighbouring lordships, from which they transplanted to Greece the feudal regime with which they

¹ For the general historical background, see *Jean Longnon*, *L'Empire latin de Constantinople et la principauté de Morée* (Paris 1949); *Antoine Bon*, *La Morée franque. Recherches historiques, topographiques et archéologiques sur la principauté d'Achaïe (1205–1430)* (Paris 1969); *David Jacoby*, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale. Les "Assises de Romanie": sources, application et diffusion* (Paris, La Haye 1971) 17–91; *Denis A. Zakythinos*, *Le Despotat grec de Morée*, vols. I–II (London ²1975); *Kenneth M. Setton*, *The Papacy and the Levant (1204–1571)*, vol. I, *The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Centuries* (Philadelphia 1976) 1–162.

² *Jacoby*, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, 213–236; *Anthony Luttrell*, *The Latins of Argos and Nauplia: 1311–1394*, in: *Papers of the British School at Rome* 34 (n.s. 21) (1966) 34–55, repr. in: *idem*, *Latin Greece, the Hospitallers and the Crusades 1291–1440* (London 1982) VIII.

³ Crete has been purposely left out of this paper because it was entirely in the Venetian orbit and its development, therefore, differed in several ways from that of the Greek mainland and the islands in the latter's vicinity.

⁴ *Kenneth M. Setton*, *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311–1388* (London ²1975), and *idem*, *The Papacy and the Levant*, vol. I, 405–473.

⁵ *Jacoby*, *La féodalité en Grèce médiévale*, 185–202, 210–211, 237–239, 271–81, 295–302; *Johannes Koder*, *Negroponte. Untersuchungen zur Topographie und Siedlungsgeschichte der Insel Euböia während der Zeit der Venezianerherrschaft* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften 112, Wien 1973); *B. J. Slot*, *Archipelagus Turbatus. Les Cyclades entre colonisation latine et occupation turque, c 1500–1718*, vol. I (Nederlands historisch-archaeologisch Instituut te Istanbul 51, Istanbul 1982) 13–65.

were familiar. Other knights came from northern and central Italy. The quest for landed fiefs was the main incentive prompting their settlement in Latin Greece, yet in the fourteenth century we also find in the Principality of Morea knights and sergeants holding exclusively money-fiefs or money-sergeantries. The lords and their retinue resided either in inland castles or in the acropolis of their main city. Whatever the case, many of them also owned or held property in urban centres. Economic pursuits, namely trade, banking and the exercise of crafts induced a far larger number of Latin commoners, mostly Italians, to settle in the main ports and some inland cities of Latin Greece. The strong political links existing between the Kingdom of Naples and the Principality of Morea since the late 1260s and the military support provided by the former to the latter fostered economic intercourse between these regions, afforded opportunities for the merchants and bankers active in the kingdom to extend their business to the principality, and enhanced the immigration of knights and commoners from southern and central Italy to the Peloponnese. On the other hand, Venetian seaborne trade, Venice's rule over Modon and Coron and its presence in a quarter of the city of Negroponte and in neighbouring islands account for the concentration of Venetian settlers in these areas. Venetians, however, also established themselves elsewhere, as in Chiarenza, Argos and Nauplia. Finally, the Catalan conquest of the duchy of Athens in 1311 resulted in immigration from Aragonese territories and in strong economic ties with them. These various factors account for the diversity of the Latin population established in Greece and the complexity of western involvement in the economy of this region⁶.

The Latin conquest of western Romania brought about a redistribution of real estate in favour of the Latins, who took hold of imperial lands and those of absentee landlords. In addition, they confiscated some of the property belonging to, or held by local ecclesiastical institutions and members of the former Byzantine social elite, the *archontes*, remaining under their rule. This development, however, did not alter the nature of the region's predominantly agrarian economy. Land remained the main source of income, wealth and taxation. The conquerors, whether feudal lords, the Venetian state or the Catalans, displayed pragmatism and flexibility in their approach to local administrative, fiscal and legal institutions and practices. To a large extent they preserved the agrarian and social infrastructure inherited from the Byzantine period, while adapting it to the political regime they had introduced. In feudalized areas, however, the privatization of former state

⁶ *David Jacoby*, Social Evolution in Latin Greece, in: *Kenneth M. Setton* (ed.), *A History of the Crusades*, vol. VI (Madison, Wisconsin 1969–1989) 175–221; *David Jacoby*, From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change, in: *Mediterranean Historical Review* 4 (1989) 1–44, repr. in: *Benjamin Arbel*, *Bernard Hamilton* and *David Jacoby* (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204* (London 1989); *David Jacoby*, La dimensione demografica e sociale, in: *Giorgio Cracco* and *Gherardo Ortalli* (eds.), *Storia di Venezia*, vol. II (Roma 1995) 681–711. Note, however, the presence of commoners from France, Germany and England in fourteenth century Patras: *Ernst Gerland*, *Neue Quellen zur Geschichte des lateinischen Erzbistums Patras* (Leipzig 1903) 89. *

rights must have been hardly felt at the level of daily life. The basic continuity of the Byzantine infrastructure, which provided the framework for agricultural exploitation and taxation, is well illustrated by the structure of the large estates of Frankish Morea, numerous agricultural contracts, as well as Venetian and Catalan documents. Yet the flight of some *archontes* and the loss of property suffered by others who remained under Latin rule sharply reduced the financial capacity of the members of this group. The Latins also put an end to the dominant role of the local Byzantine elite in the sponsoring and financing of various economic activities in agriculture, manufacture and trade⁷.

This role is well illustrated for the eleventh and twelfth century. Indeed, the *archontes* of Thebes may be safely credited with the development of the silk industry in their city, which became the major industrial centre in western Byzantium and competed successfully with Constantinople in the quality and sophistication of its fabrics. They apparently acted as entrepreneurs, encouraging sericulture in their own region, providing capital for the industrial infrastructure, and attracting highly-skilled labour. In addition, they had a predominant share in the trade in Theban silk fabrics, either selling them to Venetian merchants or exporting them on their own to Constantinople and other Byzantine cities. Local *archontes* presumably fulfilled a similar role in other centres of silk manufacture. In addition, the *archontes* assumed the role of intermediaries between rural producers and the marketing network, as in the Peloponnese. For instance, those of Sparta sold locally or exported olive oil produced on their own and most likely also on other estates⁸. The diminished economic role of the *archontes* after 1204 provided an opportunity for the Latins to step in and exploit the resources of the territories under their rule.

On a more general level, the events of 1204 resulted in the collapse of the centralized system of imperial supervision over the economy of western Romania and definitively abolished the restrictive control of the Byzantine state over specific branches of manufacture and trade. Thus, for instance, before the Fourth Crusade the export of raw silk and several types of silk fabrics from the Empire was either prohibited or severely limited. In addition, Latins were apparently barred from investments in the Byzantine silk industry⁹. The contrast with developments in the aftermath of the Latin conquest is striking. The political fragmentation of Latin Romania stimulated competition. It prevented the Latin lords from limiting western access to raw silk or silk fabrics manufactured on their respective territories or from supervising the distribution of these commodities. It was in their best interest to provide foreign traders with direct access to sources of production and markets, attract investments, enhance foreign purchases, and thereby ensure themselves of increased revenues from trade and customs dues. In short, there was

⁷ Jacoby, *From Byzantium to Latin Romania*, esp. 26–32.

* ⁸ See David Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade*, in: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 84/85 (1991–1992) 470–488, 492.

⁹ *Ibid.* 490–492.

a striking departure from traditional Byzantine policies and practices, clearly not limited to silk, which substantially furthered Latin penetration into the economy of the region.

This last process had in fact begun much earlier, though on a more modest scale. It was fostered by the conjunction of two important developments, one proper to Byzantium and the other to the pattern of seaborne trade of the western maritime powers in the Mediterranean. Since the first half of the eleventh century the Byzantine social elite and the urban middle stratum, the latter particularly in Constantinople, enjoyed an accumulation of wealth generating a change in behavioural patterns and a rise in the consumption of luxury products. The increasing demand for silks in this framework stimulated an expansion of the Empire's silk industry and a diversification of its products, which henceforth also included lower-grade silk fabrics. The rise and development of new centres of silk manufacture in the western provinces of the Empire since the eleventh century, particularly at Thebes, Corinth and Patras, as well as in the islands of Andros and Euboea, was clearly oriented toward the supply of the Byzantine internal market, primarily the Empire's capital. The higher standard of living of a section of the urban population in Constantinople was also illustrated by the growing consumption of foodstuffs imported from remote provinces¹⁰.

The seaborne trade of Venice, Amalfi, Pisa and Genoa in the Eastern Mediterranean was closely linked to this general evolution¹¹. It was not limited to the exchange of goods between these cities and Romania, as commonly believed. Since the second half of the eleventh century Venetian merchants and carriers took advantage of their sailing between Venice and Constantinople to engage in business operations in the main ports of call along their way. They increasingly conveyed agricultural, pastoral and industrial commodities between the provinces and the capital of the Empire and thus progressively expanded their operations within the internal trade and shipping networks of Byzantium. For instance, in the twelfth century the Venetians were involved in complex business ventures involving silk fabrics and presumably also other commodities between Thebes, the Peloponnese, Thessalonica and Constantinople. In addition, they exported oil from the Peloponnese and cheese from Crete to the Byzantine capital. This development partly accounts for the Venetian dominance among foreign traders active in the Peloponnese and neighbouring territories, located along their main sailing route, before the Fourth Crusade. The first stage of Venetian commercial expansion within Romania was followed by a second one, when the Venetians gradually extended the geographic range of their operations in this region by connecting them with others in the Levant and in Egypt in the early twelfth century. Thus, for instance, Venetian merchants exported Byzantine silk fabrics and cheese to Egypt. Somewhat later Pisan and Genoese merchants active in Egypt and the Levant

¹⁰ Ibid. 472–473, 494.

¹¹ For what follows, see *ibid.* 493–500; *David Jacoby*, *La Venezia d'oltremare nel secondo Duecento*, in: *Cracco and Ortalli*, *Storia di Venezia*, vol. 2, 263–299.

similarly expanded their trade to Romania. This general development was greatly enhanced by the establishment of Latin rule and privileged commercial outposts in the Levant in the wake of the First Crusade. In this period, then, the formerly loosely connected trade links between the West, Romania and the Near East were integrated within a triangular system, each of these regions interacting with the others and enhancing commerce and shipping between them with its own products. The existence of this triangular network was of substantial importance for Latin migration, settlement and economic activity in the areas of western Romania, especially after the Fourth Crusade.

Seaborne trade between the West and the Byzantine Empire before 1204 was primarily based on the circular, cyclic and seasonal migration of travelling merchants returning to their base of departure. In addition, however, this trade also generated linear migration leading to the temporary or permanent settlement of small numbers of Latins in some key points within the Empire, the most important of which in western Romania were Thebes, Corinth and the city of Euripos, later known as Negroponte. The location of this region along the main waterways linking Venice and other western ports to both Constantinople and the Levant was of major importance in this respect. After 1204 the function of western Romania as a transit area within the triangular trade system of the Eastern Mediterranean further enhanced circular and linear migration. Three new factors substantially contributed to this process: the opening of the region to the Latins and the latter's easier access to local resources, including the products of the rural hinterland, the presence in the region of a resident Latin population and clientele, and new patterns of western demand. The latter derived from some general developments in the West since the twelfth century, which essentially consisted in a rise in purchasing power of an ever larger section of the population, in particular within the urban class, a growing inclination toward the display of luxury as a status symbol, and a refinement in daily life.

The conjunction of these factors called for a larger and more variegated supply of commodities, among which the share of finished products grew consistently. Yet it also provided the background to the rise of the Italian cotton and silk industries in the twelfth and their substantial growth in the thirteenth century, and to the accrued western demand for a diversified supply of industrial raw materials, which included high-grade dyestuffs used in all western textile industries. Latin Greece contributed its share to this supply. It exported to Italy raw silk, wool, locally manufactured textiles, hides, in addition to wine, raisins, oil, cheese, honey, as well as salt since the 1280s. This traffic was largely in the hands of Italian carriers from southern Italy, Genoa and especially Venice. The Latins, in particular those settled in western Romania, also increasingly intruded since the thirteenth century into short-haul and regional trade and transportation, and even the indigenous Greeks relied ever more on their ships. The enhanced demand in Italy for the products of western Romania, the intensification of commercial exchange between the two regions, the growing share of Italian vessels in this traffic and, finally, the activity of Italian travelling merchants and settlers led to a decisive

change in the orientation of western Romania's economy. Prior to the Fourth Crusade its surpluses of agricultural, pastoral and industrial products primarily supplied the internal Byzantine market, particularly Constantinople. By contrast, in the thirteenth century the region became increasingly integrated within a trade network largely geared toward the West, a shift substantially furthered since the second half of that century by Venetian presence and activity in the region. Indeed, the seaborne trade and shipping of Latin Greece were increasingly subordinated to the requirements, routes and seasonal rhythm of long-distance maritime trade dominated by Venetian merchants and carriers. These took advantage of Venice's naval and diplomatic protection and the logistical infrastructure offered by its colonies and commercial outposts.

The expanding volume of Latin mercantile migration, settlement and economic activity in western Romania was channeled to specific locations. Not surprisingly, Modon, Coron and Negroponte, regular stopovers for vessels sailing between Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean, were among the main beneficiaries of these developments. They supplied services to transiting merchants and ships, mainly Venetian. In addition, they functioned as warehouses, distribution centres and transshipment stations for commodities in transit or collected from nearby areas. Finally, they served as bases for western penetration into the hinterland. The same holds true of Patras and Corinth, both included in the Principality of Morea¹². These two ports acted as outlets for their own silk fabrics and the produce of their fairly rich countryside¹³. The evolution of Frankish Corinth in the thirteenth and fourteenth century is now better known, thanks to recent excavations and stratified coin finds¹⁴. The city enjoyed a lively economic activity, at any rate from the 1250s until the Catalan attack of 1312, judging by coins issued in Corinth itself by William II or in Chiarenza by this prince and his successors, building activity, and the import of pottery from northern and central Italy, in addition to Venice. All these suggest an increasing role of the city as regional commercial centre, its firmer integration within the western trade system, and a growing affluence¹⁵. The pres-

¹² For Patras, see *Bon*, *La Morée franque*, 449–453, and *Elene Saranti-Mendelovici*, *A propos de la ville de Patras aux 13^e-15^e siècles*, in: *Revue des études byzantines* 38 (1980) 219–232, none of whom, though, deals in a satisfactory way with the city's economy. Various aspects of the latter are examined by *Gerland*, *Neue Quellen*.

¹³ *David Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese: the Evidence of Fourteenth Century Surveys and Reports*, in: *Haris A. Kalligas* (ed.), *Travellers and Officials in the Peloponnese. Descriptions – Reports – Statistics*, in Honour of Sir Steven Runciman (Monemvasia 1994) 44–48, 54–55, 59–61. See also below.

¹⁴ For the history, see *Bon*, *La Morée franque*, 474–475. Archeological reports are by *Charles K. Williams*, *II* and *Orestes H. Zervos*, *Corinth*, 1990: Southeast Corner of Temenos E, in: *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 19–44, 51–58; Frankish Corinth: 1991, in: *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 133–191; Frankish Corinth: 1992, in: *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 1–52; Frankish Corinth: 1993, in: *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 1–56; Frankish Corinth: 1994, in: *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 1–60.

¹⁵ *Williams* in: *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 176–177, and *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 33–35, ascribes both the construction and the import of the pottery to the period beginning in the 1290s, while in: *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 16–22, to the late thirteenth century. The historical arguments for this dating are not convincing, and I shall return to them elsewhere. In any event, the coin finds

ence of coins issued by the Frankish dukes of Athens until 1311 confirm that Corinth continued to serve as a port of transit for the lordship of Athens and for Thebes in particular¹⁶. In 1312 the Catalans inflicted heavy damage on Corinth, attested by written and especially by archeological evidence. In the 1340s and 1350s Corinth suffered from Turkish raids¹⁷. The resulting sharp decline in population and in the volume of economic activity is illustrated by limited rebuilding of poor quality, the disappearance of Corinth's silk industry, and the absence of coins until the 1360s. Moreover, after 1311 the Catalans' use of Livadostro, a city under their rule, as maritime outlet for the lordship of Athens and particularly Thebes deflected a portion of their trade from Corinth¹⁸. Corinth appears nevertheless to have witnessed later the transit of commodities produced in its countryside, namely grain, raisins and *grana* or kermes, a scarlet dye derived from the dried bodies of a female insect, as attested for the 1330s by the commercial manual of Francesco Balducci Pegolotti¹⁹. Despite the efforts of Niccolò Acciaiuoli to restore the economy of the lordship of Corinth, which he obtained in 1358, the seigniorial revenue yielded by the city itself in 1365 was still lower than about 1210²⁰. Since the 1370s Corinth appears to have recovered and again fulfilled a fairly important role in trade, as suggested by the large number of Venetian coins found there²¹. It is also noteworthy that in 1389 the lord of Corinth, Nerio I Acciaiuoli, had merchandise "to the value of 12,000 to 15,000 florins", if not more,

point to prosperity beginning earlier. On building activity in the time of William II, see *Williams* in: *Hesperia* 60 (1991) 37–38; *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 142–146; *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 20.

¹⁶ Evidence on these functions in the preceding Byzantine period in *Ralph-Johannes Lilie*, *Handel und Politik zwischen dem byzantinischen Reich und den italienischen Kommunen Venedig, Pisa und Genua in der Epoche der Komnenen und der Angeloi (1081–1204)* (Amsterdam 1984) 195–197.

¹⁷ *Antonio Rubió i Lluch* (ed.), *Diplomatari de l'Orient català (1301–1409)* (Barcelona 1947) [hereafter: DOC] no. 57, a letter of 1312 by Pope Clement V; *Elizabeth A. Zachariadou*, *Trade and Crusade. Venetian Crete and the Emirates of Menteshe and Aydin (1300–1415)* (Venice 1983) 42, 56, 66.

¹⁸ On Livadostro, see *Kenneth M. Setton*, *Catalan Domination of Athens, 1311–1388* (London 1975) 35, 85, 88. Yet on trade between Thebes and Corinth in the 1330s, see *Francesco Balducci Pegolotti*, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. *Alan Evans* (Cambridge, Mass. 1936) [hereafter: *Pegolotti*] 119. On the fate of Corinth's silk industry, see *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 48–49, 58.

¹⁹ *Pegolotti*, 118, 149, 157, 208, 297.

²⁰ Shortly after 1210 Prince Geoffrey I of Villehardouin granted 400 hyperpers out of the revenue of the commercium of Corinth as money-fief: *Marino Sanudo Torsello*, *Istoria del Regno di Romania*, fol. 1v., in: *Charles Hopf* (ed.), *Chroniques gréco-romanes inédites ou peu connues* (Berlin 1873) 100; in 1365 the total seigniorial revenue from the city was only 615 hyperpers: *Jean Longnon* [et] *Peter Topping* (eds.), *Documents sur le régime des terres dans la principauté de Morée au XIVe siècle* (Paris, La Haye 1969) [hereafter LT] 162. See also *Jacoby*, *From Byzantium to Latin Romania*, 14–15.

²¹ The earliest is from the time of Doge Andrea Dandolo (1343–1354); the largest numbers are from the reigns of Andrea Contarini (1368–1382) and Antonio Venier (1382–1400): see *Alan Stahl*, *The Venetian Torneseello. A Medieval Colonial Coinage* (The American Numismatic Society, *Numismatic Notes and Monographs* 163, New York 1985) 24–25, 82, and the reports mentioned above, n. 14.

stored in Corinth²². By contrast, Thebes suffered neither from the Latin conquest of 1209 nor from the Catalan conquest of 1311, and remained the major industrial * centre of western Romania in the thirteenth and fourteenth century. Theban silks, renowned for their high quality, were exported to the West in the thirteenth and first quarter of the fourteenth century. In 1300 Venice granted the duke of Athens exemption from taxes for the transit of twenty pieces of samite he sent to the papal court. An unpublished commercial manual composed in Florence in the 1320s and later western sources attest to exports of silk fabrics to the West and Egypt²³. Not surprisingly, Thebes aroused wide interest among Latin merchants and bankers, as will soon be shown.

In addition to the economic factors considered until now, military factors as well as political and territorial fragmentation in Latin Greece also contributed to the development of consumption and trading centres, to changes in the trade network, and to the distribution and concentration of Latin migration and settlement. Andravida, in the midst of the fertile plain of Elis, was one of the major urban centres of the Peloponnese at the time of the conquest. Its choice as princely residence shortly afterwards was largely determined by two major considerations. The extensive pasture land surrounding it enabled the grazing of numerous horses, a prime military factor initially related to the conquest of the southwestern Peloponnese and, later, to the maintenance of the principality's cavalry. Secondly, a short distance only separated Andravida from the most convenient landing place along the western coast of the peninsula at which military reinforcements and supplies could be brought in from Italy. The political function of Andravida, underscored by the convening of the princely court and knightly assemblies, contributed to the establishment of an episcopal see in the city and attracted settlers, both knights and commoners²⁴.

The connection of the landing place just mentioned with Andravida decisively contributed to the swift economic and urban growth of a new port, Chiarenza, which by the mid-thirteenth century had already become the main emporium of Frankish Morea. Its role as outlet for the growing export of rural products from its hinterland to Italy and as transit port further contributed to its economic development²⁵. The princes had a mansion in the city, at which Isabella of Villehar-

²² These sums appear in a proposal submitted to Venice by Nerio's brother, Donato: *Jean Alexandre Buchon* (ed.), *Nouvelles recherches historiques sur la principauté française de Morée et ses hautes baronnies*, vol. 2/1 (Paris 1843–1845) 238.

²³ *Jacoby*, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, 464 and n. 63; for the 1230s and 1240s, see below 118–119; for 1300: *Elena Favaro* (ed.), *Cassiere della Bolla Ducale – Grazie – Novus Liber* (1299–1305) (*Fonti per la storia di Venezia*, Sez. I – Archivi pubblici, Venezia 1962) 32 no. 136: *pro faciendo gratia ... de dacio peciarum .XX. de samitis quas idem dominus dux misit ad Romanam curiam per aquas nostras*.

²⁴ At the time of the conquest: *Jean Longnon* (ed.), *Livre de la conquête de la princée de l'Amorée. Chronique de Morée* (1204–1305) (Paris 1911) [hereafter: *Chronique de Morée*] pars. 92–93, 105. On the Frankish city: *Bon*, *La Morée franque*, 318–320, 547–553, 590–591, 677–678.

²⁵ According to *Chronique de Morée* par. 110, this was definitely a new port: *dou port de*

douin and Philip of Savoy stayed for some time after arriving in the Morea in * 1301²⁶. From Giovanni Boccaccio's story of Alatiel, the daughter of the sultan of Egypt, we may gather that it was located on a cliff overlooking the shore, possibly within the *castrum* or citadel²⁷. Some knights and barons also had houses in the city²⁸, and the princely court was occasionally convened there, all of which enhanced Chiarenza's economic activity. The city maintained its expansion and prosperity as long as the favorable geo-political conditions that enabled its rise persisted. It may have already begun to decline in the late fourteenth century. According to an estimate made in 1391 for Amadeo of Savoy, who aspired to become prince of Frankish Morea, there were only about 300 households or between 1,200 and 1,500 inhabitants in Chiarenza²⁹. Finally, two more urban centres enjoying a limited growth should be mentioned in this context. Political factors promoted the development of Athens, its lord residing on the Acropolis, and that of Naxos, capital of the duchy bearing that name, which had the advantage of being accessible from the sea. The presence of the rulers, their court and administration attracted Latin settlers and stimulated economic activity.

Some of the cities just mentioned were not only trading and consumption centres, but also functioned as financial markets. In the thirteenth century credit required for commercial and non-commercial purposes in western Romania was mainly supplied by resident Italian merchants and bankers. The connection between trade and credit in Latin Romania is well illustrated since an early date. The Venetian Matteo di Manzolo at first conducted trade from Venice with the Aegean island of Melos, which belonged to the Duchy of Naxos ruled since 1207 by a

Saint Zacarie, la ou la ville de Clarence est ores, i.e. now. On the city: *Bon*, La Morée franque, 320–325, 602–607; *Elene Saranti-Mendelovici*, He mesaionikē Glarentza, in: *Diptycha he-taireias byzantinōn kai metabyzantinōn meletōn* 2 (1980–1981) 61–71, both without sufficient considerations about the economy. The transit function of Chiarenza in the 1330s is well conveyed by *Pegolotti*, 117: Et se la mercatantia che mettesi in Chiarenza non la volessi vendere in Chiarenza e volessila trarre di Chiarenza per portarla in altra parte a vendere, sì la puoi trarre senza pagare niuno diritto.

* ²⁶ *Chronique de Morée* pars. 848–867, esp. 858; *Alfred Morel-Fatio* (ed.), *Libro de los fechos et conquistas del principado de la Morea* compilado por comandamiento de Don Fray Johan Ferrandez de Heredia (Publications de la Société de l'Orient latin, Série historique 4, Genève 1885) pars. 506–513, esp. 509.

²⁷ *Vittore Branca* (ed.), *Decamerone* in: *Tutte le opere di Giovanni Boccaccio*, vol. 4 (Milano 1974–1983) 169–171, Second Day, Seventh Tale. As shown recently, the story is not based on historical facts yet contains some trustworthy elements, among them on Chiarenza, reflecting Boccaccio's years in Naples from 1326 to 1339, his friendship there with Niccolò Acciaiuoli, and his acquaintance with Florentine merchants and bankers active in the Morea; the *Decamerone* was completed between 1349 and 1351: see *Peter Schreiner*, Ein Mord in Glarentsa: der *Decamerone* von Boccaccio und die Peloponnes im 14. Jahrhundert, in: *Hero Hokerda, Edmé R. Smits and Marinus M. Woesthuis* (eds.), *Polyphonia Byzantina. Studies in Honour of Willem J. Aerts* (Groningen 1993) 251–255. For the location of the citadel, see *Bon*, La Morée franque, Album, plate 22.

²⁸ LT 48 l. 29, house of Lise du Quartier prior to 1337; 196 ll. 19–23, house of Lorenzo Acciaiuoli in 1379, which he may have inherited from his father Niccolò.

²⁹ Text in *Bon*, La Morée franque, 692.

branch of the Venetian Sanudo family. He settled in Melos some time before 1219, yet by 1222 had returned to Venice. In 1239 he apparently resided and traded in Negroponte, where he served as agent for Angelo Sanudo, duke of Naxos, and acted as guarantor for a loan which the latter received from Andrea Ghisi, another Venetian³⁰. Thebes was yet another important banking centre, in which credit played an important role in the financing of the local silk industry³¹. Since 1255 both Guy I of la Roche, lord of Athens, and Venice sided with the barons of Euboea who refused to acknowledge the suzerainty of the prince of Morea, William II, over the island³². It is not surprising, therefore, that after arriving in Negroponte at the head of a Venetian military contingent Marco Gradenigo should have turned to Thebes to finance his activity. In December 1255 he borrowed the sum of 2,740 hyperpers from a group of seven of the city's Latin *burgenses*, long-term or permanent residents, among whom we find one hailing from Brindisi and three others bearing the surname Grasso. In May 1256 three members of the consortium gave power of attorney to three merchants from Piacenza, with whom they obviously conducted business, to obtain the reimbursement of their share of the loan from the Commune of Venice³³. One of these individuals, Rinaldo Beccario, had been living for many years in Venice, from where he operated as far as Greece³⁴.

Chiarenza, however, became the major credit centre of Latin Greece in the second half of the thirteenth century. A number of merchants hailing from Italian inland cities and settled in Chiarenza were involved in trade and in credit operations. Two of them known by name, both Sieneese, warrant our attention. They were granted fiefs in Frankish Morea as partial or full repayment for large loans made to Prince William II or to Angevin baillis who ruled the principality after the prince's death in 1278. One of them was Petrono of Siena, established at Chiarenza since about 1260. In 1293 Prince Florent of Hainault intervened on his behalf after the authorities of Ancona had confiscated a sum of 1,400 florins belonging to him, from which we may gather that his inclusion within the knightly class of Frankish Morea did not prevent him from pursuing his commercial and financial dealings³⁵. The same holds true of Mino Mainetti, or Manetti, another Sieneese

³⁰ For the career of Matteo di Manzolo: *Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca and Antonino Lombardo* (eds.), *Documenti del commercio veneziano nei secoli XI-XIII* (Torino 1940) [hereafter DCV] nos. 558, 583, 592, 606, 607, 628, 640, 643, 646, 756, 765, 774 (1245, with reference to 1239); see also *Jacoby*, *La Venezia d'oltremare nel secondo Duecento*, and for the loan, *idem*, *La féodalité*, 271–272. *

³¹ For details, see below 118–119.

³² Background in *Jacoby*, *La féodalité*, 24, 190–193.

³³ DCV no. 833. In this document the surname Grasso is spelled 'Grasius'. It is attested in both Venice and Genoa: see below, n. 86.

³⁴ Rinaldo Beccario de confinio Sancti Eustadii in Venice appears as quondam de Placentia, nunc Venecia commorante as early as January 1247 (and not 1246, as indicated by the editors): *ibid.* no. 778.

³⁵ *Charles Perrat et Jean Longnon* (eds.), *Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée, 1289–1300* (Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France, Série in 8^o.6, Paris 1967) 70–71 no.

residing at Chiarenza. Some time before 1294 he was rewarded with a fief in the principality and full exemption from commercial taxes on land and maritime trade³⁶. We lack any information, however, about the commodities these Sienese handled.

The business methods of Italian bankers settled in Latin Greece, the links between them and their colleagues, and the particular circumstances necessitating large non-commercial loans in this region are strikingly illustrated by the unpublished will of the Sienese Azzolino Rustichino, drafted in the latter's residence in the city of Negroponte by a Sienese notary on 11 October 1312. This individual apparently belonged to the rich and influential Sienese mercantile and banking family of the Piccolomini³⁷. Since he does not mention this family in his will, he may have been acting on his own. Azzolino had a personal account book, in which he registered in detail his financial operations. He explicitly mentions one of them *prout continetur distinte in libro meo*, which clearly points to his activity as a merchant-banker³⁸. In the preceding years Azzolino had conducted his major dealings with Walter, count of Brienne and Lecce, duke of Athens from the summer of 1309 to his death at the hands of the Catalan Company on 15 March 1311. In the spring of 1310 Walter of Brienne had hired this military contingent in order to re-establish the protectorate held since 1303 by his predecessor Guy II of La Roche over the Greek state of Thessaly, and waged with it a successful campaign that enabled him to extend his rule northwards, beyond the territory of southern Thessaly already in his hands. The financing of this costly military venture compelled Walter to borrow heavily. His inability to muster all the necessary resources induced him after the campaign to retain in his service only two hundred horsemen and three hundred foot soldiers of the Company, and to dismiss the others without paying the arrears he owed them for four months. This step led to his confrontation with the Company, his violent death, and the loss of

67: quod dictus Petronus jam sunt anni triginta et plus elapsi qui pheudetarius et homo noster ligius extiterat et burgensis [Clarentie].

³⁶ *Perrat et Longnon*, Actes relatifs à la principauté de Morée, 97–98 no. 94; he appears as mercator and habitator of Chiarenza, a term generally pointing either to a fairly recent settlement or to temporary residence. The Manetti were among the families of Siena legally excluded from the popolo and later from government, although exceptionally one of its members served on the Council of the Nine in 1304: *William M. Bowsky*, A Medieval Commune. Siena under the Nine, 1287–1355 (Berkeley 1981) 72.

³⁷ I wish to thank here Dott. Mario Borracelli, Siena, who has kindly sent me a transcription of this precious document, preserved at the Archivio di Stato of Siena, which he plans to publish. He has also suggested the link with the Piccolomini family. A contract by Ranieri di Rustichino Piccolimini in 1258 indeed points to the name 'Rustichino' in the family: *Edward D. English*, Enterprise and Liability in Sienese Banking, 1230–1350 (Cambridge, Mass. 1988) 47–48. On the Piccolimini, see *ibid.* 22–25, 85–93.

³⁸ In Venice the bankers' ledgers were *cosa publica* and had the same authority as notarized documents: see *Reinhold C. Mueller*, The Role of Bank Money in Venice, 1300–1500, in: *Studi Veneziani*, n.s. 3 (1979) 49–50, 59. This appears to have also been the rule elsewhere.

his duchy³⁹. As surety for a loan he received from Azzolino the duke pledged 13,905 florins on the income of his French lordship of Brienne, in Champagne⁴⁰.

After Walter's death his widow, Jeanne of Châtillon, possibly held out for some time on the Athenian Acropolis before fleeing to the city of Negroponte, like many other Frankish residents of the duchy⁴¹. She granted Azzolino a confirmation of the duke's pledge⁴², and obtained from him another loan, for which she owed 8,000 hyperpers. It would seem that as surety for one of the loans either Walter of Brienne or his widow had deposited with the Sienese banker a gold crown adorned with pearls and precious stones, which presumably belonged to the duke, a garland, the nature of which is not specified, and jewels worth 800 hyperpers which possibly were Jeanne's own. The Sienese banker had entrusted these pawns to Agostino Sassi for sale, because neither the duke nor the duchess were in a position to reimburse the loans and he apparently needed cash⁴³. Significantly, Azzolino Rustichino had been appointed *baiulus* or administrator of the Duchy of Athens, presumably by Walter during his brief rule or else by Jeanne before she left Negroponte for Naples, in the hope that his business experience would be most useful once the territory were recovered from the Catalans. It was also a convenient way to enable him the recovery of his loans directly from the revenue of the duchy⁴⁴.

³⁹ Longnon, *L'empire latin de Constantinople*, 295–299; on Walter of Brienne: Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, 6–13; on political and territorial aspects: David Jacoby, *Catalans, Turcs et Vénitiens en Roumanie (1305–1332): un nouveau témoignage de Marino Sanudo Torsello*, in: *Studi Medievali*, 3a serie 15 (1974) 226–232, repr. in: *idem*, *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XIIe au XVe siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies* (London 1979) V.

⁴⁰ Walter paid four ounces a month to heavily armed horsemen, two to light cavalymen and one to foot soldiers: E. B. (ed.), *Crònica de Ramon Muntaner*, Text i notes, vol. 6 (Col·lecció popular Barcino, Barcelona 1927–1952) 106, chap. 240. If the two hundred horsemen whom the duke retained in his service after six months of campaign were of the first category, their wages would have swallowed up the entire loan, since they totalled 4,800 ounces (200 x four ounces a month x 6) or 24,000 florins. On the exchange rate of one ounce: 5 florins, see below 116.

⁴¹ Morel-Fatio, *Libro de los fecho*, pars. 552–554. Setton, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, 13, wrongly believes that the duchess fled to the Morea. Negroponte, however, was a far more likely destination, considering its proximity to Athens and the arrival there of Frankish refugees (*cuncti fideles latini*) from the duchy, mentioned by Clement V in 1313: DOC nos. 60 and 318, a reference of 1371 to their numerous descendants in the island. Finally, Azzolino's residence is yet another argument in favour of Negroponte.

⁴² Azzolino's will mentions two letters, one from the duke and the other from Jeanne.

⁴³ This individual had died in the meantime, and the objects were to be delivered by the executors of his will to those of Azzolino. In January 1321 Jeanne's son Walter of Brienne came of age and was compelled to assume liability for the debts incurred by both his parents with respect to their Greek lands, according to two documents published by André du Chesne (ed.), *Histoire de la maison de Chastillon sur Marne* (Paris 1621) Preuves, 212–214. The first of these documents also appears in DOC no. 112. For their correct dating, see Luttrell, *The Latins of Argos and Nauplia*, 35 n. 3.

⁴⁴ While at Naples Jeanne was sending reinforcements to her lordship of Argos and Nauplia by March 1312: Karl Hopf, *Geschichte Griechenlands vom Beginn des Mittelalters bis auf unsere Zeit*, in: *Ersch und Gruber*, *Allgemeine Enzyklopädie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 85

Azzolino Rustichino was a wealthy man, judging by his yet unrecovered loans, the large liquid capital he owned, and his numerous legacies reaching a total of several thousand florins. Incidentally, one of these consisted in 100 florins promised to the Hospitallers *pro passagio de ultramare*. Yet, apart from using his own resources in business, he took advantage of his business connections to enlarge the capital at his disposal. His legacies to ecclesiastical institutions in Athens, Negroponte, Chiarenza and particularly Siena, as well as to individuals in this city and Thebes, point to these connections. He appointed Vanne di Tese Tolomei, a rich and influential member of this family in Siena, as one of the three executors of his will in Italy, France and elsewhere in the West⁴⁵. Two mercantile and banking companies formed by the Tolomei were operating at that time, yet had run into serious difficulties⁴⁶. He owed 100 Sienese pounds to Guccio Viviano of Siena, who belonged to the Vignari family, several members of which served on the Council of the Nine ruling the city in that period⁴⁷. Azzolino further acknowledged a small debt to Elabruccio Saraceni of Thebes, most likely a member of the Sienese Saraceni family which played a prominent role in Siena's trade, banking and government in the late thirteenth and fourteenth century⁴⁸. When the Catalan Company invaded the Duchy of Athens in 1311 the Saraceni of Thebes, like many other Latins settled in the duchy, fled to Negroponte where they are later attested as a prominent and rich family⁴⁹. Azzolino also acknowledged a debt of 300 florins to the Florentine Cerchi Bianchi mercantile and banking company (*societas*), active in this period in Greece⁵⁰. In short, he had business connections

(Leipzig 1867–1868) 411. On 22 November of the same year she appointed her own father Walter of Châtillon bailus and procurator of all the Brienne possessions, thus also those in Greece, presumably after learning of Azzolino's death: text in *Nicolas Vigner* (ed.), *Histoire de la maison de Luxembourg* (Paris 1619) 245. Walter appears in this capacity, though without explicit reference to the title, in several documents of 1314 and 1318: DOC nos. 63, 65, 93.

⁴⁵ On this individual, see *Bowsky*, *A Medieval Commune*, 113, 274; *idem*, *The Finance of the Commune of Siena* (Oxford 1970) 147 n. 101.

⁴⁶ See *English*, *Enterprise and Liability*, 79–100.

⁴⁷ *Bowsky*, *A Medieval Commune*, 73, 97 and 267–268, on the name Viviano in the family.

⁴⁸ *English*, *Enterprise and Liability*, 65 n. 27, 95 n. 42, 98 n. 51, 109.

⁴⁹ Saraceno de' Saraceni appears as burgensis of Negroponte in 1359 and as civis of the city in 1381: DOC nos. 239 and 467, respectively. In 1381 he was among the prominent individuals to whom Pedro IV of Aragon recommended his representative in Greece. In 1370 he was awarded full Venetian citizenship, presumably in return for financial and possibly also diplomatic support to Venice: *Ferdinand Gregorovius*, *Geschichte der Stadt Athen im Mittelalter von der Zeit Justinian's bis zur türkischen Eroberung*, vol. 2 (Stuttgart 1889) 210 and n. 1: *nostre civitatis Negropontis burgensis* [i.e., he lived in the Venetian part of the city] *originarius civis prefatae civitatis* [i.e. of Venice]. Gregorovius rightly suggested that the family originated in Siena. *Setton*, *Catalan Domination of Athens*, 186, errs in assuming that it was Venetian. Saraceno's daughter Agnes wedded Nerio I Acciaiuoli, who became lord of Athens in 1388, and like him died in 1394. His son Pietro was also involved in the affairs of the region: *ibid.* 186, 191, 198.

⁵⁰ On which see also below 113–114.

with members of prominent mercantile and banking families of Siena and Florence, and his ventures also extended to the West.

The loans offered by Azzolino were substantial. Since the mid-thirteenth century, however, there was an increasing demand in Latin Greece for large-scale non-commercial credit, which individual bankers were unable to meet. These circumstances opened the way to Italian mercantile and banking companies holding more liquid assets, enjoying a superior business organization, and operating in a wider geographic setting. These companies, which began to appear in the West in the early thirteenth century, shared several features. They were founded and maintained their headquarters in inland cities of central Italy, from where they gradually expanded the range of their activity as far as Flanders and England. They were corporate bodies endowed with a continuous legal identity that transcended the temporary partnerships binding their respective members. Their operation was based on a network of permanent agencies established outside the home-city, run by partners or by factors, salaried employees, who were formally empowered to act on behalf of the company they represented. The branches of the company were practically autonomous in their dealings, yet coordinated their business with their headquarters by correspondence and by messengers. The company also employed local correspondents at places where it had no permanent branch. After being stationed for some years at one location, partners and factors were transferred to another branch, as if rotating around their head-office, or returned to the latter. This rotating migration constituted a third type of mercantile mobility, in addition to circular and linear migration, already noted earlier⁵¹.

There is yet another feature common to the Italian mercantile and banking companies that should be stressed. They initially engaged in long-distance commercial and financial operations exclusively linked to western overland trade and consistently abstained from direct investments in shipping, a principle upheld throughout their existence⁵². This last feature goes far to explain their absence from the Eastern Mediterranean region up to the 1240s. Since then, however, they extended their activity to the crusader Levant and to Frankish Greece. Factors and circumstances common to both areas account for this development. The heavy expenditure for military purposes incurred by rulers, feudal lords and governors in the Eastern Mediterranean required credit on a massive scale⁵³. In addition, the financial operations of the Papacy, which essentially consisted in the transfer of funds to the papal treasury, were carried out on a fairly regular basis with the help

⁵¹ On the structure, legal continuity, operation, personnel and account books of the companies, see *Armando Sapori*, *Storia interna della compagnia mercantile dei Peruzzi*, in: *idem*, *Studi di storia economica (secoli XIII-XIV-XV)* (Firenze 1955-1967) 653-694; *idem*, *Il personale delle compagnie mercantili del medioevo*, in: *ibid.* 695-763.

⁵² In this respect the business methods of the mercantile and banking companies of Italian inland cities contrasted sharply with those of the merchants of maritime cities such as Venice, Genoa and Pisa.

⁵³ See *David Jacoby*, *Migration, Trade and Banking in Crusader Acre*, in: *Lenos Mavromatis* (ed.), *The Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean* (Athens 1997) [in press].

of Italian mercantile and banking houses since the 1230s⁵⁴. This last type of operations led to the establishment of business relations with Latin church dignitaries.

The presence of Italian mercantile and banking companies in Latin Greece is documented since the 1270s. The earliest evidence in this respect appears to be included in a letter of 1273 sent by King Charles I of Sicily to Prince William II of the Morea, in which he asked to dispense justice to a Pisan citizen having a claim *contra Scottum vel personas alias*. This may well be a reference to the Scotti company, yet it is unclear where it was based since firms bearing that name existed in both Piacenza and Siena⁵⁵. In any event, neither the nature nor the scope of the company's business in Greece is known. The cash book of an unidentified Sienese company covering the years 1277–1282 provides more reliable and detailed information and offers a glimpse into the management of mercantile and banking companies in general at that time. This company, which had many dealings with another Sienese firm, the Tolomei, combined trade in local commodities such as wool, linen and felt, and in imported woollens from the Low Countries with extensive money-lending in central and southern Italy⁵⁶. Yet it also engaged in large-scale operations in Romania, as implied by a reference to its *Livro de la ragione di Romania*, or 'account book of Romania', that unfortunately has not survived⁵⁷. Several precise references in the extant cash book of the company point to the existence of a branch at Chiarenza, which served as a base for financial and commercial dealings in the Peloponnese and possibly also in neighbouring areas. Factors and messengers travelled, apparently quite regularly, between Siena and Chiarenza via Pisa, Barletta or Naples⁵⁸. In June 1278 Uguccio da Chiarenza brought

⁵⁴ Glenn Olsen, Italian Merchants and the Performance of Papal Banking Functions in the Early Thirteenth Century, in: David Herlihy, Robert S. Lopez and Vsevolod Slessarev (eds.), *Economy, Society and Government in Medieval Italy. Essays in memory of Robert L. Reynolds* (Kent, Ohio 1969) = *Explorations in Economic History* 7 (1969) 43–63; *English*, Enterprise and Liability, 9–40.

⁵⁵ Riccardo Filangieri et al. (eds.), *I registri della cancelleria angioina*, vol. 10 (Napoli 1950–) 93 no. 373 (29 June 1273): Iacobo Alfei, procuratori Bergii quondam Symeonis de Quarto, civi pisano. On the Scotti in Siena, see *English*, Enterprise and Liability, 16, 35, 46; on those of Piacenza, see Pierre Racine in: Piero Castignoli and Maria Angiola Romanini (eds.), *Storia di Piacenza*, vol. II, *Dal vescovo conte alla signoria (996–1313)* (Piacenza 1984) 198, 221–222, 301–346.

⁵⁶ Guido Astuti (ed.), *Il libro dell'entrata e dell'uscita di una compagnia mercantile senese del secolo XIII (1277–1282)* (Documenti e studi per la storia del commercio e del diritto commerciale italiano 5, Torino 1934) X–XXII, for the nature of the company, its account book and the range of its activities; see IX, for the dating of the book's sections. On relations with the Tolomei, see Robert-Henri Bautier, *Les Tolomei de Sienne aux foires de Champagne d'après un compte-rendu de leurs opérations à la foire de Provins en 1279*, in: *Recueils de travaux offerts à M. Clovis Brunel*, vol. 1 (Paris 1955) 110, repr. in: *idem*, *Commerce méditerranéen et banquiers italiens au Moyen Age* (Aldershot, Hampshire 1992) VIII.

⁵⁷ Astuti, *Il libro* 121 (August 1278).

⁵⁸ *Ibid.* 251: merchandise brought from Romania in May 1282; 306: via Pisa to Romania in May–June 1278; 351: via Barletta to Chiarenza in October 1278; 482: via Pisa to Chiarenza in March 1280; 484: a letter received by messenger from Chiarenza via Naples in March or April 1280.

to Siena a *feldello* of an unspecified merchandise. Since the term was often used for the standard parcel of raw silk, it would seem that the company occasionally imported this commodity from Greece⁵⁹. Another item in the account book refers to Meo Tancredi da Chiarenza, who owed the company a large sum, part of which he reimbursed in April 1280⁶⁰.

The extant cash book of the Sienese company warrants our attention for yet another reason. It lists in great detail the daily movement of money, separating debit and credit entries, the former registered in the front half and the latter in the rear half of the ledger. In order to obtain the weekly balance the smaller total of either debit or credit was transferred to the other section. The cash book thus displays an innovative method of double-entry book-keeping, invented in Tuscany somewhat earlier, about the mid-thirteenth century, and perfected since⁶¹. We may be sure that the same method was applied in the Romania account book and in the office of the company at Chiarenza. It follows that since the last quarter of the thirteenth century the Italian mercantile and banking companies introduced new forms of business management into Latin Greece, the wider implications of which will be examined below. Their activity in Frankish Morea is well conveyed by Marino Sanudo the Elder, a Venetian author of the first half of the fourteenth century. In the time of Prince William II, he writes, "there was so much courtesy and kindness that not only the knights but also the merchants went around without cash (...) and with a simple handwritten note of theirs, cash was delivered to them"⁶². This flowery description points to the existence of individual accounts and to the grant of both consumption and commercial loans by mercantile and banking companies.

Several of these companies based in Florence extended their business to Latin Greece about 1300, yet it is unclear whether all of them had resident agents in Chiarenza, the centre of their activity in the region⁶³. The Cerchi Bianchi appear

⁵⁹ On the *feldello*, see *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 48 n. 26.

⁶⁰ *Astuti*, *Il libro* 111, 159, and 250, a payment partly made in *torneselli piccioli* di Chiarenza in March 1282.

⁶¹ Periodical balances were apparently also established in the same period by the Tolomei, and most likely other Italian companies operating at the fairs of Champagne: *Bautier*, *Les Tolomei de Sienne*, 114–116. They must have been based on a system similar to the one applied in the account-book of the Sienese company. On the evolution of double-accounting, see *Federigo Melis*, *Aspetti della vita economica medievale* (Studi nell'archivio Datini di Prato), vol. 1 (Siena 1962) 391–434, esp. 399–400.

⁶² *Marino Sanudo Torsello*, *Istoria*, fol. 1v., in: *Hopf*, *Chroniques*, 101–102: Nel suo tempo fù nel principato tanta cortesia e amorevolezza, che non solamente li cavallieri mà anche li mercadanti andavano sù e giuso senza denari ... e con il semplice loro scritto di mano se li dava denari.

⁶³ *Yves Renouard*, *Le compagnie commerciali fiorentine del Trecento* (Dai documenti dell'Archivio Vaticano), in: *Archivio Storico Italiano* 96 (1938) 41–68, 163–179, and *Sapori*, *Il personale*, in: *Studi*, 717–754, have collected extensive information on the branches and personnel of these firms. However, this information is clearly incomplete since it does not include the agencies of the companies in Latin Greece, except for one case: see below.

as papal collectors in Frankish Morea between 1303 and 1305⁶⁴ and, as noted earlier, are mentioned in 1312 in the will of Azzolino Rustichini. A factor (*procurator et gestor negotiorum*) of the Mozzi firm conducted in 1306 large-scale trade in Chiarenza, totalling a value of 3,857 hyperpers at one point, as well as in Corinth and Negroponte. In 1312 two partners of the firm were entrusted by a former inhabitant of Prato who had settled in Patras to obtain the reimbursement of 500 florins, owed to him by a member of the Bardi firm stationed at Chiarenza⁶⁵. In 1310–1311 they had dealings with the archbishop of Patras, one of the leading barons of Frankish Morea since about 1278, who also acted as papal collector in Latin Romania, and in 1313 with the Latin Patriarch of Constantinople, who resided on Venetian soil. The Scali dealt with the bishop of Coron in 1326 and the Bonaccorsi with the archbishop of Catalan Thebes in 1330⁶⁶. The growing economic activity in Corinth from the mid-thirteenth century to 1312 attracted several Italian mercantile and banking companies, the operation of which in turn stimulated the local economy. The reckoning counters or jetons of some of these companies, which were presumably represented by resident factors, have been found in recent excavations within a fairly reduced space, which suggest a concentration of their activity in a specific area of the city⁶⁷. Three of the jetons were issued by the Sienese Tolomei company, to which we shall return below. A fourth has been ascribed to the Cerchi, whose activity in Greece from 1303 to 1312 has already been noted above, yet this attribution is not warranted⁶⁸. Another jeton bearing the letter B has not been securely identified for the time being⁶⁹.

⁶⁴ *Silvano Borsari*, L'espansione economica fiorentina nell'Oriente cristiano sino alla metà del Trecento, in: *Rivista Storica Italiana* 70 (1958) 499 and n. 3.

⁶⁵ *Robert Davidsohn*, *Forschungen zur Geschichte von Florenz*, vol. 3 (Berlin 1901) 98 no. 511, and 125 no. 636: the sum was to be obtained from Benghe Cini domini Jacobi de Bardis, sotius of Cino Tigliamochi de Florentia in terra Chiarentie provincie Romanie. On the status and responsibilities of the procurator or factor, see *Sapori*, *Il personale*, in: *Studi*, 699–704; *English*, *Enterprise and Liability*, 57.

⁶⁶ *Borsari*, L'espansione economica fiorentina, 503–504. Shortly before 1278 the archbishop of Patras, who held eight fiefs, acquired the barony of Patras with its twenty-four fiefs and thus became the most prominent baron of Frankish Morea: *Bon*, *La Morée franque*, 106, 114, 146, 453–457.

⁶⁷ See *Williams* in: *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 178. It should be noted that written sources do not offer any evidence about the activity of the companies in Corinth.

⁶⁸ For the Tolomei, see *Zervos*, *ibid.* 186 and 190 no. 45; *C. Piton*, *Les Lombards en France et à Paris*, II. Jetons des Lombards aux XIVe et XVe siècles. Leurs marques, leurs poids-monnaies etc., vol. 2 (Paris 1892–1893) 98 no. 196. For the attribution to the Cerchi, see *Williams* and *Zervos* in: *Hesperia* 62 (1993) 34, 47 and 51 no. 76, yet the letter inscribed on both faces of the jeton is G, as suggested by a comparison with figures in *Piton*, *Les Lombards*, 83 no. 121, 91 no. 162, 100 no. 203. The lower part of the letter C has a different shape: see *ibid.* 91 nos. 160–161. The alternative identification with the Riccardi of Lucca is most unlikely, since there is no evidence for the operation of this company in Greece nor, for that matter, elsewhere in the Eastern Mediterranean.

⁶⁹ *Zervos*, in: *Hesperia* 61 (1992) 186 and 190 no. 44, tentatively ascribes the jeton bearing a large letter B on both faces to the Biccherna 'family' of Siena, yet the Biccherna was the leading Sienese financial magistracy, the activity of which was limited to the city itself and did not

The largest and richest Florentine companies attested in Latin Greece were the Bardi, Peruzzi and Acciaiuoli, each of which had its own permanent branch and resident personnel at Chiarenza. Those of the Bardi and Peruzzi are attested since 1301 and 1303, respectively⁷⁰. In 1317 both companies agreed to carry out financial operations on behalf of the papacy in several countries of the Eastern Mediterranean, including Frankish Morea, Negroponte and the ecclesiastical province of Neopatras in central Greece. These contracts were renewed in the following years, yet none of the two firms managed to exercise this activity on a regular base in Latin Greece⁷¹. The Acciaiuoli also engaged in such transfers, in 1321 from Catalan Thebes, on behalf of its archbishop, and in 1338 from unidentified places in Romania⁷². Piero Guicciardini was their factor at Chiarenza in May 1337, July 1341 and February 1342, and most likely remained there during all these years. In 1341 Pope Benedict XII ordered the archbishop of Patras to deliver 2,000 florins to him, in order that the sum be transferred to the papal treasury, yet the Acciaiuoli company collapsed before the money reached Avignon⁷³.

include banking: see *Bowsky*, *The Finance of the Commune of Siena*, 1–15, and *L. Borgia et al.*, *Le Biccherne. Tavole dipinte delle magistrature senesi (secoli XIII-XVIII)* (Roma 1984) 1–10. One of the alternative suggestions, the Bardi, is rather unlikely. As for the Bonsignori, they had another mark on their jeton: see *Piton*, *Les Lombards* 98 nos. 193–194, and for their heraldic standard, see *Borgia*, *Le Biccherne*, 341, and examples in figs. 5, 58, 67. Another jeton remains unidentified: *Zervos*, in: *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 52 no. 80. Its cross-like monogram bears some resemblance with the one in *Piton*, *Les Lombards*, 94 no. 174. The most recent find appears in *Hesperia* 64 (1995) 55, no. 109.

⁷⁰ *Borsari*, *L'espansione economica fiorentina*, 498–499. Mazzetto de' Peruzzi was stationed at Chiarenza: *Riccardo Predelli e Pietro Bosmin* (eds.), *I libri commemoriali della Repubblica di Venezia. Regesti (1293–1787)*, vol. 1 (Reale deputazione veneta di storia patria. Monumenti storici, Ser. 1, Documenti, Venezia 1876–1914) 26 (lib. 1 no. 108). The presence of branches in Chiarenza is not explicitly attested, yet is implied by the operations carried out by these companies. On the Bardi branch in 1312 and on those of the two firms in 1315, see above 114 and below 116, respectively.

⁷¹ Text in *Yves Renouard*, *Les relations des papes d'Avignon et des compagnies commerciales et bancaires de 1316 à 1378* (Paris 1941) 620–623, and see 163.

⁷² *Borsari*, *L'espansione economica fiorentina*, 504 and 500, respectively.

⁷³ For 1337, *Petrus Guizardinus de Aczarolis*: LT 53 l. 16; for 1341–1342: *Renouard*, *Les relations des papes d'Avignon* 166. Presumably after the collapse of the bank in 1343 Piero returned to Italy, where he is attested in 1353: *Emile-G. Léonard*, *Histoire de Jeanne 1ère, reine de Naples, comtesse de Provence (1343–1382)*, vol. 3 (Monaco, Paris 1932–1937) 503–504 no. 1. In 1360 Niccolò suggested that Piero together with Andrea Buondelmonti should accompany the newly elected archbishop of Patras, Giovanni Acciaiuoli, to his see: *ibid.* 643–644, no. 95: *Ludovico Tanfani*, *Niccola Acciaiuoli. Studi storici fatti principalmente sui documenti dell'Archivio fiorentino* (Firenze 1863) 42 and 108, states that on 17 February 1341, in anticipation of his departure from the Morea to Italy, Niccolò appointed in Chiarenza Silvestro Baroncelli, Jacopo di Donato Acciaiuoli and Manente di Gherardo Buondelmonti as his representatives in charge of the Moreot estates he had obtained somewhat earlier from Catherine of Valois. This would imply that they were stationed at Chiarenza: see *Anthony Luttrell*, *Aldobrando Baroncelli in Greece, 1378–1382*, in: *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 36 (1970) 278–279, repr. in: *idem*, *Latin Greece XII*. It should be stressed, however, that the three were Niccolò's personal representatives, and not those of the bank. Moreover, they apparently were to deal with his affairs in Italy, and not in the Morea, as we may gather from the

The three major Florentine companies also engaged in the transfer of funds for * lay rulers. In 1312 or early in 1313 the Bardi granted Prince Philip of Taranto two loans totalling 5,500 gold ounces for the defence of his Greek possessions. They were to be delivered in the Morea and reimbursed at the rate of five florins per ounce, or 27,500 florins⁷⁴. In 1315 the agents of the Bardi and the Peruzzi in Cyprus undertook to hand over in Chiarenza half the dowry promised to the infante Ferdinand of Maiorca after his marriage to Isabel of Ibelin, namely 50,000 white besants of Cyprus. Yet, since they were not sure that their respective branch in Chiarenza would have sufficient liquid capital, they promised that the missing part of the sum would be handed over by their colleagues in Messina. The other half of the dowry was to be paid either in that city or in Chiarenza⁷⁵. Eight years later the Acciaiuoli company provided loans and provisions to Prince John of Gravina, which enabled his expedition in the Morea in 1325–1326⁷⁶. The Tolomei of Siena, whose presence in Corinth before 1312 has been mentioned above, apparently also participated in the financing of the military effort. In return John of Gravina, while in the Morea, awarded in 1325 or 1326 to Diego Tolomei feudal property in the villages of Mandria and Sperone, the latter including salt pans⁷⁷. The Bardi, Peruzzi and Acciaiuoli pursued their banking operations in Frankish Morea until their failure in 1343. The houses belonging to the Peruzzi company at Chiarenza are recorded in the ledgers of the company covering the last eight years of its operation⁷⁸.

The Acciaiuoli, however, managed to supplant all their rivals in Frankish Morea. Their close relations with the Angevin court of Naples and the princes of the Morea enhanced their standing and enabled them to extend their landed, financial and commercial interests in both Italy and the principality. Their acquisition of estates in Frankish Morea is of particular interest in our context. While in

fact that the first among the three was in Florence in May 1341: *Renouard*, *Le compagnie commerciali fiorentine*, 49.

⁷⁴ *Regestum Clementis Papae V ... curia et studio monachorum ordinis S. Benedicti*, vol. 8 (Romae 1885–1892) 170–174 no. 9260 (22 April 1313) and 273–275 no. 9621 (1st September 1313). Gherardo Lanfredini, Rinaldo Lotteringhi and Dino Forzetti, representatives of the company, appear in this context. The second and the third among them are also known from other sources: see *Sapori*, *Il personale*, in: *Studi* 750 no. 292, from 1310 to 1320, and 736 no. 89, from 1310 to 1338.

⁷⁵ *Louis de Mas Latrie*, *Nouvelles preuves de l'histoire de Chypre*, in: *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes* 34 (1873) 51–52, repr. in: *idem*, *Histoire de l'île de Chypre*, vol. 4 (Famagusta 1970). The infante was about to leave for Frankish Morea in an attempt to conquer it.

⁷⁶ *Hopf*, *Geschichte*, 423–424.

⁷⁷ *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 2/1, 45, 46–47, 68. In 1342 Niccolò Acciaiuoli transferred the salt pans he held in Sperone, some of which he had bought from Diego Tolomei, to the princely court in return for a fief he received in the area of Corinth: *ibid.* 111. Sperone was situated on the western coast of the Peloponnese to the north of Andravida: *LT*, 235–236. My dating of John of Gravina's grant relies on the Angevin register, destroyed in World War II, quoted by *Hopf*, *Geschichte Griechenlands*, 408 n. 11, although he cites other registers on 423 n. 70.

⁷⁸ *Armando Sapori* (ed.), *I Libri di commercio dei Peruzzi* (Milano 1934) 21–22, 154, 276, once in 1335 and twice in 1343, when the houses were sold for 150 florins.

the Morea Prince John of Gravina granted in 1325 or 1326 feudal property in the villages of Lichina and Mandria to the Acciaiuoli company represented by Dardano di Tingo degli Acciaiuoli, its director, and five other members (*cives et mercatores florentini, socii de societate Aczarellorum de Florencia*). The grant of this fief to the Acciaiuoli did not entail the customary personal link deriving from the lord-vassal relationship, the company being a corporate body, and was thus clearly a novelty in the feudal setting of Frankish Morea. The company transferred its rights to Niccolò Acciaiuoli in 1334, a transaction confirmed in the following year by Catherine of Valois and her husband Robert of Taranto. Somewhat * later, in any case before 22 January 1336, Niccolò Acciaiuoli also purchased from Diego Tolomei his portions of Mandria and Sperone⁷⁹. The acquisition of the two fiefs, each of which included a section of the village of Mandria, consolidated Niccolò's position in the Morea, which was further enhanced by several grants made by Robert of Taranto and Catherine of Valois between 1332 and 1342, presumably in partial return for loans by the Acciaiuoli reaching some 40,000 gold ounces or 200,000 florins. About 1354 Niccolò had assembled vast holdings in Frankish Morea⁸⁰. His varied activities in the Kingdom of Naples and in Frankish Morea did not prevent him from maintaining a stake in his family's company. While residing temporarily in the Morea from October 1338 to June 1341 during the expedition of Catherine of Valois, Niccolò served as one of the two factors or agents of the Acciaiuoli branch operating at Chiarenza, the other being Piero Guicciardini, whom we have already encountered⁸¹.

⁷⁹ Several documents from 1334 to 1336: *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 2/1, 32–51. John of Gravina's grant to the bank included salt pans in Sperone: *ibid.* 111. It must have been made about the same time as the one to Diego Tolomei: see above 116. The members of the Acciaiuoli bank cited in these documents are also known from other sources: see *Renouard*, *Le compagnie commerciali fiorentine*, 48–50. Dardano di Tingo thus remained director longer than assumed by Renouard. The other members were Bivigliano di Manetto de Marocello, apparently identical with Bivigliano di Manetto Buonricoveri; Acciaiuoli di Niccolò degli Acciaiuoli, probably director of the company in 1337; Giovanni di Bonaccorso; Lorenzo di Giovanni di Bonaccorsi, a close relative of the former; and Bannus olim Bandini, who does not appear in Renouard's list.

⁸⁰ *Borsari*, *L'espansione economica fiorentina*, 486–487, 490, 497–501, 503; *Bon*, *La Morée franque*, 209–211, but loans to John of Gravina were not included in this sum. Their total amount is stated in 1342: *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 2/1, 112–113. Grants of fiefs from 1336 to 1338 and a survey of Niccolò's fiefs in 1354 or shortly afterwards in LT 19–116, 125–130 nos. I–IV, VI.

⁸¹ According to a list of branches dated 20 January 1341, which mentions Niccolò among the partners: *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 1 46 n. 1. Niccolò also appears among the eighteen members providing a loan to the Commune of Florence in 1343: *ibid.* 47 n. In his will of 28 September 1338, drafted in the first person before his departure for the Morea, Niccolò provided that 500 florins should go to the bank because the latter had run into expenses for his personal affairs, yet should it turn out that he does not have to reimburse this sum, the money should be distributed as alms: *Tanfani*, *Nicola Acciaiuoli* 32, and for the date, 37. Yet this clause does not appear in the will drafted by a notary two days later: text in *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 2/1, 161–198. Niccolò was a partner of the bank until its collapse. In the framework of the bankruptcy proceedings engaged by the

The information bearing on the activity of the Italian mercantile and banking houses in Latin Greece is scanty, fragmentary and highly selective, since it largely refers to credit and the transfer of funds. Although the companies also engaged in trade in the region, like some of the Sienese individuals mentioned above, only few notarial charters document their share in this field. It is noteworthy that the firms generally abstained from carrying cash from one place to another. Instead, they transferred funds by investing them in merchandise which they dispatched to specific destinations. This practice, common in the West, was most likely also the rule in Latin Greece. In any event, it is clear that the Italian mercantile and banking companies, in particular those represented by resident agents, contributed decisively to the influx and movement of liquid capital in Latin Greece and thereby stimulated the economy of this region.

The Italian intrusion into the economy of Latin Greece was not restricted to trade and banking. It also extended to industrial production, as illustrated by the treaty concluded in 1240 between Genoa and the lord of Athens, Guy I of La Roche, whose territory included Thebes, the major silk manufacturer of western Romania. The treaty points to the free export of Theban silk textiles by Genoese and other merchants, in sharp contrast to the severe restrictions enforced in Thebes in this respect in the Byzantine period. Yet it also reveals that the Genoese were deeply involved in the local manufacturing process, as Guy I refers to silk fabrics woven by them or woven by others for them⁸². Considering the general context of silk manufacture in this period, both in Greece and Italy, it appears that the Genoese did not participate directly in industrial production in Thebes. Rather, they acted as entrepreneurs financing the activity of a number of local silk workshops producing cloth exclusively for them. They supplied these workshops with raw materials or the capital required for their purchase and the payment of the workers' wages, and received the finished products in return. In addition, they ordered silk textiles from other Theban workshops without financing their operation. In both cases, though, they must have provided specifications for the fabrics they commissioned in order to ensure that these be easily marketable in the West. Before 1204 the Byzantine imperial court had acted similarly when ordering specific silks from Thebes for its own use⁸³. In fact, the Genoese entrepreneurs had taken over the economic role fulfilled in the Byzantine period by the Greek *archontes* who had contributed to the development of the Theban silk industry⁸⁴. Several factors explain their success in this field. They handled liquid capital on a larger scale than the *archontes* who had retained part of their assets under Frankish

commune of Florence in 1345 a mansion in the city belonging to him was sold to Gherardo di Buondelmonti and Andrea di Ranieri Buondelmonti: see *Tanfani*, Niccola Acciaiuoli, 46.

⁸² *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, vol. I (*Historiae patriae monumenta*, vol. VII, Augustae Taurinorum 1854) cols. 992–993 no. 757: *de pannis sericis ab eisdem Ianuensibus vel pro eis in terra nostra textis seu compositis, ipsi Ianuenses nobis solvere teneantur id quod ab aliis exigi solitum est et haberi.*

⁸³ *Jacoby*, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, 488–490.

⁸⁴ See above 100.

rule. Moreover, they were familiar with western trade and shipping networks involved in silk marketing. And, finally, they also filled the void left by the Frankish lords established in Thebes who, imbued with knightly values, abstained from direct involvement in the urban economy⁸⁵.

By 1240 the Genoese were already engaged for some time in the export of Theban silk fabrics and in silk entrepreneurship in Thebes, since the treaty of that year renewed a previous agreement, the date of which is unknown. We may safely assume that particularly their involvement in entrepreneurship induced a number of them to settle in Thebes, whether temporarily or permanently. It is not excluded that the three members of the Grasso family attested as *burgenses* of the city in 1255 were among them⁸⁶. Incidentally, there is further evidence for Genoese presence and activity in the same region in that period. A Genoese consul is attested in 1236 in the city of Negroponte, several Genoese merchants conducted business in this locality between 1245 and 1251, and there possibly was a Genoese community there⁸⁷. A settlement pattern linked to silk manufacture in Thebes appears all the more plausible in view of the one existing in the Byzantine period. Indeed, Venetian merchants trading in local silks resided in Thebes almost without interruption from about 1071 to the time of the Fourth Crusade⁸⁸. Some are also attested in the city after 1204 (according to unpublished documents that will be examined). Even if one takes into account the fragmentary state of our sources for this period, it is likely that their activity in Thebes diminished with the rise of the Venetian silk industry, which already by the mid-thirteenth century was producing several types of Byzantine silk fabrics. In the first half of the thirteenth century it may have become more profitable to ship raw silk from Greece to Venice than to take advantage of the skills of the Theban silk workers and export their high-quality finished products to the West. A similar development appears to have occurred with respect to the Genoese. The Theban silks they exported to Genoa presumably encountered stiff competition from the sophisticated fabrics produced at

⁸⁵ On this whole issue, with full references, see *David Jacoby*, *Silk crosses the Mediterranean*, in: *Sandra Origone* (ed.), *Le vie del Mediterraneo. Idee, uomini, oggetti (secoli XI-XVI)* (Genova 1997) [in press]. *

⁸⁶ See above 107. The surname Grasso appears in several Genoese notarial charters of the twelfth century. Guglielmo Grasso, the famous pirate who operated in the 1180s and 1190s, served as Admiral of the Kingdom of Sicily and became Count of Malta, belonged to the Genoese clan of della Volta: *David Abulafia*, *Henry Count of Malta and his Mediterranean Activities: 1203–1230*, in: *Anthony T. Luttrell*, *Medieval Malta: Studies on Malta before the Knights* (London 1975) 108–109, repr. in: *David Abulafia*, *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean, 1100–1400* (London 1987) III; *Gerald W. Day*, *Genoa's Response to Byzantium, 1155–1204. Commercial Expansion and Factionalism in a Medieval City* (Urbana and Chicago 1988) 151. On the other hand, some time before 1215 the Venetian Giovanni Grasso was apparently active in Negroponte, thus in the vicinity of Thebes: DCV, no. 559. However, there is no later evidence bearing on members of these families in the area.

⁸⁷ *Michel Balard*, *Les Génois en Roumanie entre 1204 et 1261. Recherches sur les minutiers notariaux génois*, in: *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, publiés par l'Ecole Française de Rome* 78 (1966) 480.

⁸⁸ *Jacoby*, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, 479, 494–496.

Lucca, the leading silk manufacturer of the West in that period. Precisely these marketing problems may have prompted the Genoese request of 1240 for a reduction of the customs dues on the export of Theban silks. In any event, the refusal of Guy I of La Roche to grant it must have hastened the gradual contraction of Genoese investments in the production of Theban silks, until these ceased completely. It would seem that the Genoese merchants increasingly engaged in the export of silk from Latin Greece, as noted below.

The growing Italian demand for industrial raw materials since the thirteenth century requires some further consideration. It clearly stimulated an expansion of their production in Latin Greece, a development confirmed by their export to Italy. Yet this export also had an adverse effect: it deprived the local industries of an ever larger share of their supplies and ultimately reduced their production. The export of silk and dyestuffs from Chiarenza and Patras in Frankish Morea, the Venetian ports of Modon and Coron, Byzantine Monemvasia and Negroponte is fairly well documented by notarial documents and by several fourteenth century commercial manuals⁸⁹. Not surprisingly, Lucca and Venice were the main destinations of the raw silk, silk cocoons and dyestuffs exported from western Romania in this period. The importance of Lucca in this context is illustrated by Lucchese and Genoese notarial documents of the second half of the thirteenth century, some of which mention the import of *seta chiarentana* and *seta de Patrasso*, silk from Chiarenza and Patras, respectively⁹⁰. In addition, a Pisan commercial manual composed in 1278 states that *in della Morea si pesa libra lucchese*. Considering the context in which this reference appears, the connection of the Lucchese unit with silk is obvious, since there could have been no other reason for its adoption in the Frankish Peloponnese⁹¹. Despite the absence of direct evidence, then, we may safely conclude that after 1204, at any rate in the first half of the thirteenth century, the bulk of silk exports from Frankish Morea went to Lucca via Southern Italy, a traffic still attested with respect to Naples as late as the 1380s⁹². It is a fair guess that Genoese merchants and carriers, the main suppliers of Lucca in raw silk, had a major share in this trade even before 1274, the year since which their activity in Chiarenza is documented by notarial charters⁹³. Their visits in this port in the first half of the fourteenth century, which were most likely connected

⁸⁹ On the role of some of these ports in this respect, see *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 43–48, 54–57, 59–61.

⁹⁰ References in *Telesforo Bini*, *I Lucchesi a Venezia. Alcuni studi sopra i secoli XIII e XIV*, vol. 1 (Lucca 1853) 49, 51, with correct identifications by *Salvatore Bongi*, *Della mercatura dei Lucchesi nei secoli XIII e XIV* (Lucca 1858) 36–37.

⁹¹ *Roberto Lopez and Gabriella Airaldi* (eds.), *Il più antico manuale italiano di pratica della mercatura*, in *Miscellanea di studi storici*, vol. II (Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da G. Pistarino 38, Genova 1983) 127 fol. 360 ll. 15–23. In the fourteenth century the Lucchese silk pound was also utilized in Florence and Pisa: *Pegolotti*, 197, 204.

⁹² See *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 47–48, 54, 61.

⁹³ On the Genoese role in the silk supply of Lucca from other sources, see *Jacoby*, *Silk crosses the Mediterranean*: see above n. 85.

with silk, are also illustrated by Giovanni Boccaccio's story of Alatiel in the *Decamerone*, already mentioned earlier⁹⁴.

A Venetian commercial manual completed in the 1320s at the latest, the *Zibaldone de Canal*, reveals that the silk weight used at Coron was different from the one common in Frankish Morea, clearly because this port was under Venetian rule and exported silk mainly to Venice⁹⁵. Since the second half of the thirteenth century the expanding silk industry of Venice was absorbing growing quantities of silk and kermes produced in the Peloponnese, including in the region of Corinth⁹⁶. Adverse conditions caused by Catalan and Turkish raids explain the paucity of information in the following decades. Venetian interest in the dyestuff was undoubtedly among the factors prompting the resumption of Venetian trade with Corinth since the 1360s, documented by finds of Venetian coins⁹⁷. Acorn cups used in dyeing and tanning were yet another industrial raw material exported from Latin Greece and much in demand in Venice⁹⁸. The supply of this city's industries in raw materials from Latin Greece was one of the incentives leading Venice to integrate Chiarenza and Patras within the Venetian network of long-distance seaborne trade in the early fourteenth century. Instead of sailing directly from Coron or Modon to Venice, a number of Venetian state galleys returning from Constantinople, Cyprus and the Levant were ordered each year to load the merchandise of travelling and resident Venetian traders at Chiarenza and, occasionally, also at Patras⁹⁹.

The Italian presence and economic activity in Latin Greece also affected the exploitation of rural resources. We have already noted that the integration of Italians within the knightly class of Frankish Morea began in the second half of the thirteenth century with grants of princely fiefs to merchants and bankers from central

⁹⁴ *Branca*, *Decamerone*, 165–168. This is yet another trustworthy element in the story that may be added to those mentioned by *Schreiner*: see above, n. 27.

⁹⁵ *Alfredo Stussi* (ed.), *Zibaldone da Canal*, manoscritto mercantile del sec. XIV (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, Sez. V – Fondi vari, Venezia 1967) 58 fol. 35 v. l. 19; for the dating of this work, see *David Jacoby*, *A Venetian Manual of Commercial Practice from Crusader Acre*, in: *Gabriella Airaldi e Benjamin Z. Kedar* (eds.), *I comuni italiani nel regno crociato di Gerusalemme* (Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da G. Pistarino 48, Genova 1986) 404–405, 410, repr. in: *David Jacoby*, *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion* (Northampton 1989) VII.

⁹⁶ See *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 45–47, 61. On Corinth, see above 103–104.

⁹⁷ See the reports mentioned above, n. 14. The price of kermes from Corinth is recorded in 1396: *Federigo Melis* (ed.), *Documenti per la storia economica dei secoli XIII–XVI* (Firenze 1972) 304 no. 87.

⁹⁸ In Frankish Morea: LT, 113 l. 10 (1354); 146 ll. 17–18 (1361). Export from Greece: *Stussi*, *Zibaldone da Canal*, 58–59; *Pegolotti*, 146, 149, 159, 198; *Luttrell*, *The Latins of Argos and Nauplia*, 38; *Freddy Thiriet*, *Régestes des délibérations du Sénat de Venise concernant la Roumanie*, vol. 1 (Paris, La Haye 1958–1961) nos. 156 (from Byzantine Mistra) and 595 (from Negroponte). See also below 125.

⁹⁹ *Jacoby*, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, 54–55, 59–60, yet it is obvious that the export of other commodities was also taken into account: see *Stussi*, *Zibaldone da Canal*, 58–59; *Pegolotti*, 145, 149.

Italy. Next to them we find some Venetians. Lorenzo Tiepolo, son of Doge Giacomo, held a fief in Frankish Morea in the vicinity of Coron, apparently since 1262, yet left before 1268, when he himself was elected doge of Venice. In the late thirteenth century the lord of the Aegean islands of Tinos and Mykonos, Bartolomeo I Ghisi, scion of a Venetian family, held for some time the barony of Chalandritsa after his marriage to the heiress of this fief. In 1377 the Venetian Pietro Cornaro married Marie of Enghien, heir to the lordship of Argos and Nauplia. Though of French origin, the Enghien had married into the Neapolitan nobility. In the meantime, as a result of Angevin rule over the principality, the number of Italian fiefholders had grown substantially with the grant of Moreot fiefs to royal and princely vassals and office holders, as well as to merchants and bankers residing or operating in the kingdom of Naples¹⁰⁰. Other Italians, including some members of the Florentine Medici family, were enfeoffed by the barons of Frankish Morea¹⁰¹. Some of the Italian fiefholders were settled in Frankish Morea, while others were absentee lords who managed their estates with the help of Italian agents residing temporarily or permanently in the Morea. Thus, for instance, in 1360 Averardo de' Medici, member of the well-known Florentine family, administered the lordship of Argos and Nauplia on behalf of Guy of Enghien, and in 1377 Louis of Conversano served in the same capacity as tutor of Guy's daughter¹⁰². Whatever the case, it is clear that both landholders and the higher echelon of their Italian agents considered the acquisition of fiefs, whether in return for credit or as a result of purchase, to be a profitable investment. All of them were imbued with the same capitalistic spirit. Their main concern was profit, and they were keenly aware of the economic benefits deriving from a market and export-oriented exploitation of their estates. While relying on the Byzantine agrarian and social infrastructure of the countryside, they believed that profit could be generated and expanded by improved management, the use of seigniorial authority to take full advantage of human and animal labour, in addition to proper investments, a more selective approach to production, a concentration on cash crops, the introduction of new types of culture and new farming methods achieving a rise in output. They also advocated and implemented an enhanced commercialization of the estates' produce. Both the Italian fiefholders and their agents shared yet another feature: they were highly experienced in business administration and in accounting¹⁰³.

¹⁰⁰ *Jacoby*, *La féodalité*, 84–85, 195, 213, 237–238; *Borsari*, *Studi sulle colonie veneziane*, 110–111; *Raymond-J. Loenertz*, *Les Ghisi, dynastes vénitiens dans l'Archipel*, 1207–1390 (Firenze 1975) 105–108; *Luttrell*, *The Latins of Argos and Nauplia*, 39–45.

¹⁰¹ In the fief of Argos and Nauplia: *Jacoby*, *La féodalité*, 214, 217–219. On the Medici, see also next note.

¹⁰² *Luttrell*, *The Latins of Argos and Nauplia*, 39, 50–52; *Jacoby*, *La féodalité*, 214–217, and 316–317 no. III. For the estates of Marie of Bourbon and the Acciaiuoli, see below.

¹⁰³ For instance, among those enfeoffed by John of Gravina we find Nicola de Boiano, a high-ranking financial official at the royal court of Naples and a relative of the official later found in the Morea. He died at the latest in 1342 and Niccolò Acciaiuoli obtained his land: *Buchon*, *Nouvelles recherches historiques*, vol. 2/1, 111, and see LT 144 n. 2.

The commercial approach of the Italian lords and agents and their familiarity with sophisticated management techniques are perfectly illustrated by the fourteenth century surveys of some feudal estates of Frankish Morea, one of them belonging to Marie of Bourbon and several others to members of the Acciaiuoli family. Shortly before 1354 Jacobo Buzuto from Brindisi, chief administrator of the fiefs held by Niccolò Acciaiuoli in Frankish Morea, repaired and enlarged a tower at Christiana that apparently served as a center of seigniorial administration and as residence for seigniorial officials on inspection tours. He also restored vineyards and renewed the operation of salt pans that had been neglected¹⁰⁴. In 1354 or shortly afterwards it was suggested to Niccolò Acciaiuoli to establish a *massaria*, a large farm of a type common in southern Italy, on particularly fertile seigniorial land in northern Messenia. This could be achieved, so he was advised, by increasing the number of his oxen and taking advantage of both the compulsory labour services owed by the local peasants and the hiring of fugitive peasants established in the vicinity. The same agent prompted Niccolò Acciaiuoli to order the peasants of Grebeni to put to work all their oxen when delivering their corvée on seigniorial land and raise thereby the latter's productivity¹⁰⁵. The Moreot estates of Marie of Bourbon were in particularly bad shape in 1361. Nicola de Boiano extensively recorded disagreements and litigation with other feudatories with respect to her assets and rights, and took firm action to regain whatever had been lost¹⁰⁶. He expressed his dissatisfaction with the performance of several of Marie's officials in charge of local affairs and removed them, as well as those exceeding their competence, appointing trustworthy and experienced men instead¹⁰⁷. He was particularly distressed by the behaviour of Bernardo Toscano, the leaseholder of Grizi, who instead of locally employing the villeins' work force let it to individuals in the Venetian area of Modon, obviously because it provided him with a more direct and larger income. In order to correct the situation in Grizi Nicola de Boiano temporarily suspended the peasants' obligation to perform their corvée and ordered them to restore the lord's buildings and vineyards, so that the village should be in good shape when it reverted to direct seigniorial management. In addition, he renewed the operation of the local salt pans¹⁰⁸. He took measures to prevent the flight of the villeins belonging to Marie of Bourbon, "because I do not want that in my time your villeins should run away". If security conditions permitted he in-

¹⁰⁴ LT 71 ll. 2–5; 77 ll. 6–7; 87 l. 18. On the tower, see *Peter Lock*, *The Frankish Towers of Central Greece*, in: *The Annual of the British School of Archaeology at Athens* 81 (1986) 110, yet I ascribe a somewhat different function to it.

¹⁰⁵ LT 126 ll. 14–18; 127 ll. 4–6; 128 ll. 5–8; 129 l. 25 to 130 l. 6. The reference to the villein's oxen is on 128 ll. 9–12; note particularly the following: *lo signore poria con ragione comandare li soy villani che ano lo potere che ciachuno facesse li bovi como sono tenuti*.

¹⁰⁶ LT 144–155, *passim*. He was determined to expose all the excesses of Centurione Zaccaria, one of the most powerful lords of the principality, *e se questo non probo, yo vollyo perdere la capu*: *ibid.* 151 ll. 26–30.

¹⁰⁷ See e. g. LT 145 l. 20 to 146 l. 4; 147 ll. 23–24; also 148 ll. 23–28, on the appointment of an official who was to replace him during his absence.

¹⁰⁸ LT 147 ll. 14–22.

tended to travel by sea to the area of Vasilika and Corinth, in the northeastern Peloponnese, in order to find leaseholders who would resume the cultivation of land abandoned by villeins put to flight by Turkish incursions. "Better to have something than to lose everything", he added. In one village he realized that a specific plot of seigniorial land was unsuitable for the growing of wheat, and decided that it should be converted into a vineyard¹⁰⁹. Aldobrando Baroncelli, whose family had close connections with other Florentine families settled in the Kingdom of Naples, the Buondelmonti and the Acciaiuoli, served in Greece from 1379 to 1382 at least as agent for Angelo and Lorenzo Acciaiuoli¹¹⁰. In 1379 he promised to increase the yield from the village of Sperone, which belonged to Lorenzo, by the proper use of beasts of labour and seeds¹¹¹.

The creation of new sources of revenue may be illustrated by the attention devoted to intensive cultivation relying on manure and irrigation. This type of cultivation was already practiced in the Byzantine period¹¹², yet appears to have been extended after 1204, particularly on seigniorial land on which new crops were grown. Both manure and irrigation were used in 1337 in the farming of a garden at Kotychi, in the plain of Elis, carried out by compulsory peasant labour¹¹³. Since this garden yielded an exceptionally high income, it must have been similar to the fourteenth century irrigated *cardina* or orchards attested in Crete, in which the growing of vines on treillis and particularly various fruits was being expanded under special lease contracts. Among these fruits we find cherries, marasca or sour cherries, pomegranates, peaches, pears, lemons and thick-skinned citrons¹¹⁴. Irrigation was also mandatory for the cultivation of the seigniorial orange grove located in 1354 in the fertile area of Petoni¹¹⁵. Incidentally, this is the earliest known evidence for the growing of sour oranges in Greece. Like sugar cultivation brought from the Levant or Cyprus to Crete, the introduction of citrus into Romania, whether from these same areas or Italy, clearly took place after the Latin

¹⁰⁹ LT 148 ll. 4–22, where *vaxalli* is used for *villani* (as in 1354, *ibid.* 68 ll. 2–3: *basallos seu vilanos*); 151 ll. 19–25; 147 ll. 12–13: *ca ave tristu terrinu per blava*.

¹¹⁰ On his career and his family's connections, see *Luttrell*, Aldobrando Baroncelli, 273–300. In the 1320s and 1330s, though, several Baroncelli had been partners in the Peruzzi company: see *Renouard*, *Le compagnie commerciali fiorentine*, 171–172.

¹¹¹ LT 197 ll. 6–7: *ed io m'ingegniero anchora di farlo megllio valere e con bestiame e con semente, come la vostra signoria vederà*.

¹¹² *Alan Harvey*, *Economic Expansion in the Byzantine Empire, 900–1200* (Cambridge 1989) 127–133.

¹¹³ LT 38 ll. 6–7: *ortus inrriuguus qui redit anuatim, excepto servicio hominum et fimo qui ibidem ponitur, yperpera octuaginta*; for the location, see *ibid.* 236.

¹¹⁴ *Salvatore Carbone* (ed.), *Pietro Pizolo, notaio in Candia (1300, 1304–1305)* (*Fonti per la storia di Venezia*, Sez. III – Archivi notarili, Venezia 1978–1985) nos. 445, 911, 990, all referring to the Cretan village of Macrendigho, south of Candia, in 1300 and 1304; see also below, n. 117. Water distribution was carried out on specific days *secundum consuetudinem loci*. See also *Mario Gallina*, *Una società coloniale del Trecento. Creta fra Venezia e Bisanzio* (*Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, Miscellanea di studi e memorie* 28, Venezia 1989) 19–21, 43–44, 57–58.

¹¹⁵ LT 113 l. 18: *arbores arangorum curie*.

conquest¹¹⁶. These luxury crops were highly appreciated and fetched a high price on the market. Two Cretan contracts testify that their cultivation, in particular that of citrus, was still fairly limited. In one instance the obligations of the lessee of two gardens included the yearly delivery of sixteen thick-skinned citrons, while in another the lessee was to hand over every year a full basket of each fruit he grew and, in addition, four lemon trees or saplings at the request of the lessor¹¹⁷. Large landlords could more easily than peasants invest resources in the building of expensive irrigation systems and take advantage of the water flowing through their estates or along their borders, two factors indispensable for the growing of luxury crops. It may be safely assumed, therefore, that the introduction of the sour orange at Petoni was due to the initiative of a seigniorial official managing this village after it had been handed over to Niccolò Acciaiuoli in 1338.

The Italian estate managers also took steps to increase production and storage facilities and enhance the commercialization of surpluses. Some time before 1354 Jacobo Buzuto repaired an oil press and a wine cellar at Christiana. The construction of a wine cellar at Grizi was suggested, because this village produced large quantities of wine that could easily be conveyed to the market. On the other hand, the sale of the wine produced at Petoni was seriously hampered because the village was isolated and land transportation was difficult. It would be wise, therefore, to keep this wine for the use of the lord and his family. An additional fish-pond was envisaged for Pilla¹¹⁸. In 1361 Nicola de Boiano reported that because of misman-

¹¹⁶ On the earlier diffusion of citrus cultivation, see *Andrew M. Watson, Agricultural Innovation in the Early Islamic World. The Diffusion of Crops and Farming Techniques*, 700–1100 (Cambridge 1983) 42–50, 89–90, 168 n. 21; *Eliyahu Ashtor, Essai sur l'alimentation des diverses classes sociales dans l'Orient médiéval*, in: *Annales, Economies, sociétés, civilisations* 23 (1968) 1025–1026. On the whole the growing of citrus fruit in Latin Greece has been hitherto overlooked. *

¹¹⁷ *Carbone*, Pietro Pizolo, no. 911; *Antonino Lombardo* (ed.), *Zaccaria de Fredo, notaio in Candia (1352–1357)* (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, Sez. III – Archivi notarili, Venezia 1968) no. 82. In 1300 a resident of Candia was nicknamed 'Citron', presumably because of his sour temper: *Carbone*, Pietro Pizolo no. 363. From this amusing instance we may gather that the fruit was already known in Crete at that time, yet citrus growing in general was still fairly limited in Romania. *Pegolotti* 294, includes cederni or citrons in a list of commodities, yet without referring to their origin or destination. The extract of a Greek account book from Rhodes dated to the last two decades of the fourteenth century mentions two shipments including a total of 600 lemons (lemoni), 40 oranges ([n]erantzi) and 6 thick-skinned citrons (kitron), possibly originating in the island of Kos: *Peter Schreiner* (ed.), *Texte zur spätbyzantinischen Finanz- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, in: *Handschriften der Biblioteca Vaticana* (Studi e Testi 344, Città del Vaticano 1991) 70 and 73 ll. 46–47 (text and trans.), 66–67 (dating), 78 (commentary). Significantly, citrus fruit does not appear in fourteenth century commercial manuals. Yet later, about 1450, citrons (cedri) and oranges (melaranci) were exported from Coron and Modon: *Giorgio di Lorenzo Chiarini, El libro di mercantantie et usanze de' paesi*, ed. *Franco Borlandi* (Torino 1936) 55. In the fifteenth century it was customary in Naxos for the duke's vassals to deliver to him each Christmas an orange as recognitive payment: examples in 1435 and 1453 in: *Perikles G. Zerlentes* (ed.), *Grammata frankōn doukon tou Aigaiou pelagou (1433–1564)*, in: *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 13 (1904) 145 (pomo uno di neranzo), 150 (unum pomum ranceum), and see *Jacoby, La féodalité*, 285.

¹¹⁸ LT 71 l. 5; 130 ll. 10–11; 128 ll. 14–16; 130 l. 6.

agement wine, salt, and 1,106 *modii* of acorn cups from the previous year's yield had remained unsold¹¹⁹. These export commodities had presumably not been offered for sale in time to be shipped to Venice by the autumn convoys sailing westward. Aldobrando Baroncelli found in 1379 that much wine was getting spoiled at Santo Archangelo because of the absence of a wine cellar, and decided to build one, while at Andravida he built and put into operation a mill, for which he bought a grinding stone¹²⁰.

There is yet another aspect of the Italian agents' activity in Latin Greece that deserves close attention. In 1361 Nicola de Boiano was unable to gather reliable information about the management of Vostitsa and concluded that he had to compile a new survey of the estate¹²¹. In 1379 Aldobrando Baroncelli emphasized that the report he was presenting was systematic, detailed and comprehensive, which indeed it was. He listed separately revenue and expenditure, item by item, and computed them; in addition, he recorded the assets in deposit. Aldobrando twice alluded to an account book, in which he must have used a sophisticated method of daily accounting¹²². The nature of this book is suggested by the work of the Italian official who, in 1365, established the yearly financial balance of the lordship of Corinth belonging to Niccolò Acciaiuoli. His registration and compilation included double-entry book-keeping in a more advanced form than in the Sienese account book of 1277–1282, mentioned earlier, receipt and expenditure being placed on opposite pages. This bilateral form was common at that time in Italian mercantile and banking companies¹²³.

The Italians thus introduced into Latin Greece innovative methods in the exploitation and management of agricultural and other resources. Non-Italian barons and knights and Greek feudatories holding fiefs in Frankish Morea were in close touch with them. They met at their lord's court or with their lord's Italian agents, several of them had houses in the ports of Frankish Morea and the neighbouring Venetian territories, and they conducted business with Italian traders and bankers¹²⁴. As a result, they must have increasingly adopted the market and ex-

¹¹⁹ LT 146 ll. 17–18; 148 ll. 1–3.

¹²⁰ LT 205 ll. 22–27; 206 ll. 18–21; 215 l. 16.

¹²¹ LT 146 l. 6: *Conveneme omne cosa fare da novu li inventarii, zo che avete en queste parti.*

¹²² LT 196 ll. 11–13: *e per cierto io ci metto uno ordine si chiaro che per cierto vi piacera, e vedrete insino a uno danaro quello checci e.* The reports alluded to are LT 199–215 nos. XI–XII. On silk and cash in deposit at Modon: *ibid.* 215 ll. 4–5, 19–20. References to the account book: *ibid.* 207 l. 3; 215 ll. 2–3.

¹²³ LT 158–192 no. IX; see introduction 158, and 187 l. 20. For a Venetian example dated to the period from 1340 to 1363, see *Sandra Origone, Peter Schreiner, Annotazioni di conto veneziane nel Vaticano Ottobiano Greco* 14, in: *Römische Historische Mitteilungen* 29 (1987) 281–314. See also above 112.

¹²⁴ *David Jacoby, The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnesus after the Fourth Crusade*, in: *American Historical Review* 78 (1973) 891–902, repr. in: *idem, Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale II*. See also *idem, From Byzantium to Latin Romania*, 6–8; *idem, Jean Lascaris Calophéros, Chypre et la Morée*, in: *Revue des études byzantines* 26 (1968) 207–211, repr. in: *idem, Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine* (London 1975) X.

port-oriented economic approach of the Italians and have been influenced by their improved estate management. The Italian business approach also spread to Byzantine Morea. Frankish lords and their Byzantine counterparts maintained permanent contact in various ways. In some areas of the Peloponnese the feudal lords of the principality and *archontes* or ecclesiastical institutions of Byzantine Morea shared the revenue of villages situated along the common borders of the two political entities, the so-called “casaux de parçon”. This arrangement involved agreements between the parties concerned and ensured them an intimate knowledge of agricultural work and management in these villages¹²⁵. In addition, Byzantine *archontes* attended seasonal fairs held in Frankish Morea. In June 1296, for instance, one of them visited the fair of Vervena, in Arkadia, in order to sell his raw silk, presumably because western traders attended this fair¹²⁶. The Byzantine province in the Peloponnese was also connected with its neighbours and Italy by maritime trade. According to an anonymous commercial manual compiled in Florence about 1320, the inhabitants of Monemvasia had earned a bad reputation for occasionally taking hold of the merchandise brought to their city by foreign traders, yet these nevertheless visited the port¹²⁷. Merchants from Monemvasia are attested in Venetian Crete in 1336–1337¹²⁸, and passing ships sailing between Italy and the eastern Mediterranean lands anchored sometimes at Monemvasia¹²⁹.

It is time to conclude. In the thirteenth and fourteenth century the temporary or permanent presence of an increasing number of Latins in Greece, mainly in coastal cities, and the activity of Italian merchants and bankers, whether visitors or residents, contributed to the infusion of liquid capital from the West and to its free flow between the various sectors of the economy. As a result Latin Greece experienced an ever stronger economic interaction between the rural area, the cities, and long-distance maritime trade. The Italian merchants and bankers also introduced new forms of business management, credit and marketing, which stimulated a growth in agricultural and pastoral productivity and output, generated a restructuring of production and trade and, more generally, boosted the economy of Latin Greece. The intimate interconnection between the various types of migration we have noted, settlement and economic evolution is thus obvious.

¹²⁵ See *David Jacoby*, *Un régime de coseigneurie gréco-franque en Morée: les ‘casaux de parçon’*, in: *Mélanges d’archéologie et d’histoire*, publiés par l’Ecole française de Rome 75 (1963) 111–125; repr. in: *idem*, *Société et démographie VIII*. In 1295 the Greek archon Photios visited the villages located in the area of Corinth which he shared with the Franks: *Chronique de Morée* pars. 663–664.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.* pars 802–803.

¹²⁷ Firenze, Biblioteca Marucelliana, ms. C 226, fol. 53v, where incidentally an interesting remark is made about imports to Monemvasia: *Portaxi a vendere in Malvagia niente, perche habitatori di detta terra sono mala gente*.

¹²⁸ *Raimondo Morozzo della Rocca* (ed.), *Lettere di mercanti a Pignol Zucchello (1336–1350)* (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, Sez. IV – Archivi privati, Venezia 1957) nos. 1–2.

¹²⁹ Genoese evidence: *Michel Balard*, *Escales génoises sur les routes de l’Orient méditerranéen au XIVe siècle*, in: *Recueils de la Société Jean Bodin*, 32, vol. 1 (1974), *Les grandes escales*, 248–249, 262.

Silk crosses the Mediterranean

In the Middle Ages silk first reached the Latin West in the form of finished products. Written sources, extant silk textiles and silk terminology point to a continuous flow of silk fabrics in the period extending from the seventh to the mid-thirteenth century.⁽¹⁾ These silks were highly valued for their textures, their interwoven or embroidered decorative patterns made of silk, gold or other materials, their occasional decoration with pearls or precious stones and, finally, their colors. The provenance of these silks and the itineraries along which these travelled varied over the centuries. From Byzantium, the Levant and its huge Asian hinterland, the Caucasus, and Spain, their main areas of origin, the silks were either directly conveyed across the

Mediterranean, or else followed the land routes connecting the Black Sea via Central Europe to the Latin West. The fabrics arrived in this region as gifts, tributes or commercial commodities. The continuity and importance of trade within the flow of silks, already well attested by written sources since the late eighth century, has been generally overlooked.⁽²⁾ Since the late eleventh century, however, the direct Mediterranean link rapidly gained in importance and by the following century became the dominant factor in the channeling of silk fabrics to the Latin West. The expansion of the main Italian maritime powers in the Mediterranean played a major role in this shift. It also contributed decisively to the transfer of the silk technology and the raw

(1) This is a preliminary draft of a comprehensive study on the transfer of silk from the Eastern Mediterranean to the Latin West in the Middle Ages and on the economic context of this process. For lack of space I have purposely limited the chronological and geographical scope of this paper. On an earlier period, see the short survey by D. Claude, *Der Handel im westlichen Mittelmeer während des frühen Mittelalters*, in *Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa*, Teil II = "Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen", Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, 144 (1985), pp. 85-87. The following abbreviations are used below: ASG = Archivio di Stato, Genova; "BEC" = "Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes"; CDG = C. imperiale di Sant'Angelo (ed.), *Codice diplomatico della repubblica di Genova*, Roma, 1936-1942; MGH = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*; Pegolotti = Francesco Balducci Pegolotti, *La pratica della mercatura*, ed. A. Evans, Cambridge, Mass., 1936; SS = *Scriptores*; TTh = G.L. Fr. Tafel und G.M. Thomas (eds), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Wien, 1856-1857.

(2) The importance of trade in silks imported to the Latin West has been rightly stressed by E. Sabbe, *L'importation des tissus orientaux en Europe occidentale au haut moyen âge (IX^e et X^e siècles)*, in "Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire", 14 (1935), pp. 811-848, 1261-1288, and esp. 829-830, 1275-1288. This pioneering study, which deals exclusively with France, the Low Countries and Germany, requires various emendations and additions. It should also be supplemented by Italian, Byzantine and Arab sources, not used by the author, which clearly point to the continuous commercial import of silk fabrics. On some tenth and eleventh century gifts and tributes from Byzantium to the West, see D. Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade*, in "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 84/85 (1991/1992), p. 489. Islamic Spain produced 'eastern' silk fabrics: see below. *

materials that enabled the rise and growth of industrial silk manufacture in the Latin West, which began in Lucca.

The diffusion of silk fabrics in the Latin West was at first restricted to rulers, lay and church dignitaries and ecclesiastical institutions, who received them as gifts or could afford to purchase them.⁽³⁾ The so-called "lamb-stuff" preserved in the collegiate church of Notre Dame at Huy, Belgium, is a seventh century piece apparently originating in Bokhara, where silk weaving was practiced since the pre-Islamic period, at first with Chinese silk. The Huy silk as well as other pieces of the same provenance and period are samite, a strong and glossy cloth in twill weave.⁽⁴⁾ The Lombard ruler of Benevento, Arechi II (758-787), presented the convent of Santa Sofia in his city with purple silks

of Byzantine origin and with others, named *tyria*, of unknown provenance.⁽⁵⁾ Pieces of silk and others of half-silk, made of silk and cotton, originating in Khoraśān and dated to the late eighth century were inserted between the pages of the Bible of Theodulf, a manuscript produced in the last years of Charlemagne (768-814).⁽⁶⁾ Theodulf, who was bishop of Orléans (788-821), hints at Arab imports of silks to Arles.⁽⁷⁾ In his *Gesta Karolini Magni*, Notker Balbulus reports that while hunting in the Friuli Charlemagne disapproved of his companions dressed as on festive days in precious silk garments acquired at Pavia.⁽⁸⁾ His successor Louis the Pious (814-840) granted many silks to the dignitaries of his court, churches and monasteries, among them pieces of sendal (*cindatum*), a lightweight silk cloth in tabby weave.⁽⁹⁾ Va-

(3) For examples, see below. A Muthesius, *The Impact of the Mediterranean Silk Trade on Western Europe before 1200 A.D.*, in *Textile in Trade. Textile Society of America, Biennial Symposium*, Washington, 1990, p. 130, contends that the Papacy in the eighth and ninth century imparted a strong taste for the use of silks in the churches of Rome, which spread to other churches in the West. However, the diffusion of these fabrics in ecclesiastical institutions began much earlier and, independently from possible papal influence, was promoted by their utilization in the households of the western social elite.

(4) On this and other pieces from the same region and period: D.G. Shepherd and W.B. Henning, *Zandaniji Identified?*, in *Aus der Welt der Islamischen Kunst. Festschrift für Ernst Kühnel zum 75. Geburtstag am 26.10.1957*, Berlin, 1959, pp. 15-40; D.G. Shepherd, *Zandaniji Revisited*, in M. Flury-Lemberg und K. Stolleis (eds.), *Documenta Textilia. Festschrift für Sigfrid Müller-Christensen*, Berlin, 1981, pp. 105-122, on two further examples ascribed to the ninth century, see A. Stauffer, *Die mittelalterlichen Textilien von St. Servatius in Maastricht* (Schriften der Abegg-Stiftung, VIII), Riggisberg, 1991, pp. 117-118, nos. 52-53. See also K. Riboud et G. Vial, *Quelques considérations techniques concernant quatre soieries connues*, in Flury-Lemberg und Stolleis, *Documenta Textilia*, pp. 129-151, and esp. pp. 144-149, on samite and its evolution.

(5) *Translatio S. Mercurii*, in *MGH, SS rerum langobardicarum et italicarum saec. VI-IX*, p. 577: *de purpureis gausapis* [= altar cloths] (...) *et telis Phocaico stagnine textis*, "woven with the thread of Phocis"; although there is no further evidence on silk manufacture in this region of Greece, the text hints at a Byzantine product: see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 454-455. The *Translatio* is dated to 768: see A. Potthast, *Wegweiser durch die Geschichtswerke des europäischen Mittelalters bis 1500*², Berlin, 1896, II, p. 1481. *Tyria* are mentioned in S. Borgia (ed.), *Memorie storiche della pontificia città di Benevento dal secolo VIII al XVIII*, Roma, 1763-1764, I, p. 271. They were named after the city of Tyre, famous for its production of murex purple and the dyeing of textiles with this colorant, an activity attested up to the Arab conquest: see G. Steigerwald, *Die Purpursorten im Preisedikt Diokletians vom Jahre 301*, in "Byzantinische Forschungen", 15 (1990), pp. 229-237; see also below, n. 61. By the eighth century *tyria* had already become a generic term for a type of purple cloth, the origin of which cannot be established unless explicitly stated.

(6) See R. Pfister, *Les tissus orientaux de la Bible de Théodulf*, in *Coptic Studies in Honour of W.E. Crum*, Boston, 1950, pp. 501-529. These silks may have travelled to the West via Constantinople. Half-silks from Khoraśān are attested in this city in the late ninth century: A.A. Vasiliev, *Harun ibn-Yahia and his Description of Constantinople*, "Seminarium Kondakovianum", 7 (1932), p. 158, and for the dating of this text, pp. 149-152.

(7) Theodulfus, *Carmina contra iudices*, in *MGH, Poetae latini aevi carolini*, ed. E. Duemmler, Berolini, 1881, I, p. 499, vv. 211-212.

(8) *Notkeri Balbuli Gesta Karoli Magni imperatoris*, II, 17, ed. H.F. Haefele, *MGH, SS, N.S. XII*, Berlin, 1959, p. 86, ll. 15-17: *Ceteri vero, utpote feriatis diebus, et qui modo de Papia venissent, ad quam Venetici de transmarinis partibus omnes orientalium divitias adveclassent*, For the dating of this work to 886-887, see *ibid.*, pp. XII-XVI. The authenticity of the anecdote has been disputed, yet the use of silks at that period is well documented.

(9) *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium*, cap. 17, ed. S. Loewenfeld, *MGH, SS rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum*, 28, Hanno-

rious silk fabrics, including some dyed in purple, were recorded among the gifts received by Pope Gregory IV (827-844).⁽¹⁰⁾ The will of Venice's doge Giustiniano Particiaco, mentioned silk fabrics (*pallia*) belonging to the basilica of San Lorenzo in Venice.⁽¹¹⁾

While Venice's links with Byzantium are well known, its early commercial relations with the Islamic world have not drawn sufficient attention.⁽¹²⁾ The activity of Venetian merchants in the Eastern Mediterranean turned them into major importers of both Byzantine and Islamic silk textiles. Notker Balbulus, who presumably wrote in 886-887, mentions various silks and *tyria purpura* among the oriental luxury wares the Venetians brought to Pavia, from where they were conveyed further north.⁽¹³⁾ The continuity of this trade is attested by Abbot Odo of Cluny

in his *vita* of St. Gerald of Aurillac, presumably composed between 936 and 942, which may also illustrated conditions about half a century earlier.⁽¹⁴⁾ It is further confirmed by the *Honorantie civitatis Papie*, compiled about 1010-1020 yet also reflecting an earlier period,⁽¹⁵⁾ and by an inquiry conducted by Doge Otto Orseolo (ca. 1009-1026).⁽¹⁶⁾ Liutprand of Cremona, who visited Constantinople in 949-950 and again in 968, is more specific about the export of high-grade silks from Byzantium to Italy by Venetian and Amalfitan merchants.⁽¹⁷⁾ One of the provisions of the chrysobull issued by the co-emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII to Venice in 992 appears to have been directly related to this trade, in which Latin merchants from Bari and elsewhere in Southern Italy, such as Gaeta, as well as Jews from this region were also involved.⁽¹⁸⁾ *

verae, 1886, p. 53. For numerous other examples of eastern silks documented in the West in this period, see Sabbe, *L'importation des tissus orientaux*, as above, n. 2. A small number of rich merchants, such as those mentioned *ibid.*, p. 1287, could also afford silk fabrics for personal use.

(10) L. Duchesne (ed.), *Le Liber Pontificalis. Texte, introduction et commentaire*, Paris, 1955-1957, II, pp. 77-78: *vestis de tiroo, blattea bizantea, oloverum*. On the first cloth, see above, n. 5; on the others, see below, nn. 38 and 37, respectively.

(11) A. Gloria (ed.), *Codice diplomatico padovano dal secolo sesto a tutto l'undicesimo* (Monumenti storici pubblicati dalla Deputazione veneta di storia patria, ser. I - Documenti, 2), Venezia, 1877, p. 14, no. 7; F. Gaeta (ed.), *S. Lorenzo* (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, Sez. II - Archivi ecclesiastici - Diocesi Castellana), Venezia, 1959, p. 7, no. 1. On *pallium* for silk fabric, see also below, n. 14.

(12) I shall deal with them in a forthcoming study. See lately J.-CL. Hocquet, *Méthodologie de l'histoire des poids et mesures. Le commerce maritime entre Alexandrie et Venise durant le haut Moyen Age*, in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* ("Settimane di studio del centro italiano sull'alto medioevo", 40), Spoleto, 1993, pp. 847-883.

(13) See above, n. 8. Notker's testimony is certainly valid for his period.

(14) S. Gerald's *Aureliaci fundatoris vita*, I, cap. 27, in *Patrologia latina*, CXXXIII, col. 658: note *vel pallia vel pigmentorum species*; for the dating of this text, see F.L. Ganshof, *Note sur un passage de la vie de Saint Géraud d'Aurillac*, in *Mélanges offerts à M. Nicolas Iorga par ses amis de France et de langue française*, Paris, 1933, pp. 298-299. The text refers to a Venetian merchant active at Pavia who was familiar with the prices of silk cloth in Constantinople, and obviously imported them.

(15) C. Brühl, C. Violante, *Die "Honorantie civitatis Papie". Transkription, Edition, Kommentar*, Köln-Wien, 1983, p. 18, 11. 53-67, and commentary on p. 40 to line 56. For the layers of the text and their dating, see *ibid.*, pp. 77-85. The Venetians were liable to yearly collective payments in kind, including a precious silk piece (*pallium unum optimum*) and, in addition, a *paratura* for the wife of the royal *magister camere* at Pavia. The groups of merchants from Salerno, Gaeta and Amalfi each similarly delivered this item, which the editors consider a figured silk fabric. Accordingly, they correct *pigmata* (*parature*) into *figmenta*: text *ibid.*, p. 18, 11. 66-78 and 71 and correction on p. 19; see commentary to these lines on pp. 45-46. However, the association of *pigmata* with an ivory comb and a mirror seems rather to point to *pigmata* or colors, in this case for make-up, as the right version; see also Odo of Cluny, above, n. 14. The *paratura* would thus clearly not be a silk fabric.

(16) Johannes Diaconus, *Chronicum venetum*, in G. Monticolo (ed.), *Cronache veneziane antichissime*, I (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 38), Roma, 1890, pp. 178-179; on the identification of the localities mentioned, see Brühl-Violante, *Die "Honorantie civitatis Papie"*, pp. 43-44.

(17) Liutprand v. Cremona, *Opera, Relatio de legatione constantinopolitana*, cap. 53, 55, ed. J. Becker (*MGH, SS rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum*, 41), Hannover und Leipzig, 1915, pp. 204 and 205.

(18) Ed. by A. Pertusi, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel secolo XI*, in *La Venezia del Mille* (Storia della civiltà veneziana, X), Firenze, 1965, pp. 155-160, esp. 157. The passage in the new edition by M. Pozza, G. Ravegnani (eds.), *Pacta veneta, IV, I trattati con Bi-*

Since the tenth century the participation of Amalfi in the import of Byzantine and Islamic silks was furthered by its continuous trade relations with Byzantium and the Islamic countries of the Levant, the Maghreb and Spain.⁽¹⁹⁾ It is noteworthy that "Greek", i.e. Byzantine silks are documented in Christian Spain since the early part of that century, and that in 997 a minister of the Caliphate of Cordoba granted two garments of *Rūmī* or Byzantine brocade.⁽²⁰⁾ On the other hand, Spanish silks were recorded in Rome in the time of Pope Leo IV (847-855).⁽²¹⁾ Silk manufacture in Islamic Spain was strongly influenced by the Near East and some of its fabrics imitated eastern types.⁽²²⁾ Since Amalfitan merchants are attested in the Ca-

liphate of Cordova in 942,⁽²³⁾ it is quite possible that throughout this period they served as intermediaries in a two-way Mediterranean traffic in precious silks.

In Italy the Amalfitans sold silk fabrics to lay and ecclesiastical customers visiting Pavia, Rome and Amalfi itself, and they were most likely the suppliers of Spanish and Byzantine silks to the papal court and several monasteries.⁽²⁴⁾ In 1067 Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino bought at Amalfi various Byzantine silks, among them *exameta* and a *tunica diaspitin*, the latter made of "diasper" cloth.⁽²⁵⁾

The few examples adduced so far, chosen at random from among a large number of cases, illustrate the wide geographical range and the

sanazio, Venezia, 1994, p. 23, requires further emendations; see my review of this volume in "Mediterranean Historical Review", 9 (1994). My interpretation of this difficult text differs from that proposed up till now. For its relation to silk exports from Byzantium, see D. Jacoby, *The Jews and the Silk Industry of Constantinople*, in A. Lambropoulou (ed.), *ÔHÔEbraikh; parousiva sto;neJlladiko; cw'ro, 4oB<19oB aijw;naB* [*The Jewish Presence in the Greek Space, 4th-19th Centuries*], Aqhna 1994 [in press]. On the Gaetans, see also Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 460. They also traded with Pavia in this period: see above, n. 15.

(19) See M. Balard, *Amalfi et Byzance (X^e-XII^e siècles)*, "Travaux et mémoires", 6 (1976), pp. 87-92, yet the presence of Amalfitans in Constantinople in 944 does not necessarily imply the existence of a colony in the city; S. Borsari, *Venezia e Bisanzio nel XII secolo. I rapporti economici* (Deputazione di storia patria per le Venezie, Miscellanea di studi e memorie, 26), Venezia, 1988, pp. 7-8; B. Figliuolo, *Amalfi e il Levante nel medioevo*, in G. Airaldi e B.Z. Kedar (eds.), *I comuni italiani nel Regno crociato di Gerusalemme* (Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da Geo Pistarino, 48), Genova, 1986, pp. 581-600, 609-611, with reference to the influence of Sasanian and Egyptian textiles on Campania in the tenth and eleventh century, *ibid.*, pp. 596-597. On silks imported from Islamic Spain and the Maghreb, see also A. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge*, München, 1906, pp. 33, 35, 40, and following note.

(20) See U. Monneret de Villard, *La tessitura palermitana sotto i Normanni e suoi rapporti con l'arte bizantina*, in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati* (Studi e Testi, 123), Città del Vaticano, 1946, III, pp. 474-475; a source of 914 mentions *pallium grecum et alios duos in Grecia factos*; see also R.B. Serjeant, *Islamic textiles. Material for a History up to the Mongol Conquest*, Beirut, 1972, p. 169.

(21) Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, II, pp. 107-135, *passim*, and esp. 122 and 128: *veste de spanisco, de spanisca*.

(22) See the sources in Serjeant, *Islamic textiles*, pp. 89, 165-170; A. Guillou, *La soie du katépanat d'Italie*, in "Travaux et mémoires", 6 (1976), pp. 71-72. On Spanish fabrics up to the late twelfth century, see F.L. May, *Silk Textiles of Spain Eighth to Fifteenth Century*, New York, 1957, pp. 1-55. Imported Spanish silks produced from the ninth to the thirteenth century appear in Stauffer, *Die mittelalterlichen Textilien von St. Servatius in Maastricht*, *passim*. On silk and silk textiles in Tunisia, see Serjeant, *Islamic textiles*, pp. 177-180-181, and S.D. Goitoin, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed*, in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968, I, pp. 102, 223-224.

(23) Ibn Hayyān de Cordoba, *Cronica del Califa 'Abderrahman III an-Nāsir entre los años 912 y 942 (al-Muqtabis V)*, ed. and trans. by J. Viguera y F. Corriente, Zaragoza, 1981, Arabic text, pp. 322 and 327; trans. pp. 358-359 and 365.

(24) In 1025 an Amalfitan living in Naples willed to his daughter two pieces of clothing imported from Spain (*duas flectas spanicas*), presumably made of silk as they appear among silken objects: B. Capasso, *Monumenta ad Neapolitani Ducatus historiam pertinentia*, Napoli, 1881-1892, II/1, p. 252, no. 402. For Pavia, see above, n. 15. St. Gerald of Aurillac bought in Rome silk fabrics presumably imported by Amalfitan merchants: source above, n. 14. Ganshof, *Note sur un passage de la vie de Saint Gérard d'Aurillac*, pp. 304-305, suggests that these were Islamic fabrics, since they were cheaper than those purchased by a Venetian in Constantinople, yet only a comparison of the prices of two similar fabrics makes sense. It is a fair guess that those offered by the Amalfitans had been smuggled out of Constantinople and had evaded customs dues.

(25) *Monasterii casinensis Leonis [Ostiensis] Chronica*, III, 18, ed. W. Wattenbach, *MGH*, SS, VII, p. 711; on these Byzantine silks, see below.

complexity of the trade network supplying silk fabrics to the West up to the eleventh century. From Italy these silks spread further north, along the same routes as other eastern textiles and oriental spices imported from the Eastern Mediterranean.⁽²⁶⁾ Three factors appear to have heightened western awareness to the luxuries offered by the eastern Empire and the Islamic Levant and generated an increase in silk imports since the tenth century: the intensification of political and economic relations between Byzantium and the West, beginning with the Ottonian emperors; growing pilgrimage to the Holy Land, which partly led through Byzantine territory; and, finally, the expansion of trade between Italy and the Eastern Mediterranean, as well as along the routes connecting the Black Sea with the Baltic region.⁽²⁷⁾ The fragmentary evidence for this period prevents any assessment of the rhythm or volume of silk imports to the West. Byzantine textiles, however, undoubtedly constituted the overwhelming majority among them.

It is generally believed that the Byzantine state exercised a monopoly over the production and commercialization of silk textiles manufactured in the Empire up to the early thirteenth century. Moreover, it has been argued that the Empire exploited silks as an economic weapon to further its political interests and obtain military assistance

from foreign rulers and powers.⁽²⁸⁾ This reconstruction is clearly unwarranted and may be safely dismissed for the period beginning in the tenth century, and possibly even for an earlier one. First, there is no evidence that a partial or total ban on the export of Byzantine silks was ever decreed. We have already noted above that western commercial imports of Byzantine and Islamic silks are well documented since the eighth century. Various types of Byzantine silk fabrics and unworked silk were being sold in Syria by 969/970, clearly with the approval of the imperial authorities.⁽²⁹⁾ Moreover, even if the Byzantine government had enforced a ban on the export of silks, it would have been unable to prevent their smuggling out of the Empire.⁽³⁰⁾ Nor would such a ban have deprived the West from Islamic silks, the acquisition of which obviously diminished the effectiveness of any Byzantine pressure exerted by the withholding of silk fabrics. Significantly, both Byzantine and Islamic incised twills woven in the first half of the eleventh century have been found in western churches, to which some of them may have been offered by the German Emperor Henry II (1002-1024).⁽³¹⁾ Finally, a close look at Byzantine sources reveals that by the tenth century there was no general imperial monopoly on silks. The state's supervision was restricted to precious fabrics required by the imperial court for its own

(26) For textiles, see Sabbe, *L'importation des tissus orientaux*, as above, n. 2; more generally, G. Violante, *La società milanese nell'età precomunale*,² Roma-Bari, 1974, pp. 3-50.

(27) On Ottonian-Byzantine relations, see for example K.N. Ciggaar, *The Empress Theophano (972-991): Political and Cultural Implications of her Presence in Western Europe, in particular for the County of Holland*, in V.D. van Aalst, K.N. Ciggaar, *Byzantium and the Low Countries in the Tenth Century. Aspects of Art and History in the Ottonian Era*, Hernen (Netherlands), 1985, pp. 54-60, with references to previous studies. On medieval pilgrimage prior to the First Crusade, see the brief and insufficient survey by S. Runciman, *A History of the Crusades*, Cambridge, 1953-1954, I, pp. 43-50. There are many studies on the north-south trade axis in Eastern Europe which, however, is not of our concern here.

(28) Muthesius, *The Impact of the Mediterranean Silk Trade*, pp. 126, 130, goes so far as to claim that Byzantium "in return for silks, demanded Western military and naval aid", a gross misunderstanding of the subtle diplomatic game in which silks were used, yet never were the determinant factor. The author's use of historical evidence in this study is marred by several errors and overstatements.

(29) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 459-460.

(30) For evidence, see above, nn. 17, 18 and 24. On the types of fabric Liutprand attempted to export, see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 457-458, 490.

(31) See A. Muthesius, *The Silk over the Spine of the Mondsee Gospel Lectionary*, in "The Journal of the Walters Art Gallery", 37 (1978), pp. 60-66.

use and for distribution to various dignitaries and institutions, whether Byzantine or foreign. These silks, therefore, remained outside the commercial circuit. Western rulers and dignitaries were nevertheless eager to obtain them, in particular those dyed in purple or bearing imperial designs, depictions or inscriptions.⁽³²⁾ In addition to these precious and other figured or plain silk textiles, the authorities strictly supervised the diffusion of another category of expensive silks, though without hampering their export or that of other silk fabrics, provided due official authorization to this effect had been obtained.⁽³³⁾ The particular prestige enjoyed by the Empire undoubtedly promoted the growing diffusion of Byzantine silks in the West.

Not surprisingly, the West borrowed its earliest silk terminology from Byzantium rather than from the Islamic world. *Holosericus* as an adjective was used by the second half of the fourth century for high-grade textiles made exclusively of silk.⁽³⁴⁾ The term appears later in Rome from the seventh to the ninth century.⁽³⁵⁾ About 790 Charlemagne offered two *pallia oloserica* to the monastery of St. Goar, which also received a garment made of that

fabric from a Frisian merchant who had been sailing on the Rhine.⁽³⁶⁾ The *Codex Theodosianus* has a section entitled *De vestibus holoveris*, devoted to purple-dyed fabrics, and a notice belonging to the time of Pope Anastasius II (514-523) mentions *pallia olovera blattea*.⁽³⁷⁾ Greek *blattion* and Latin *blatta* were originally the terms applied to murex purple and later to purple silks in general, as in the item just quoted, yet by the ninth century *blattia* was used both in Byzantium and the West as a generic term for silks, regardless of their color. Indeed, *blattia* in colors other than purple are recorded in Rome in the late eight or early ninth century, and before 1045 Petrus Damiani stated that *blathon pallium dicitur*.⁽³⁸⁾ A somewhat similar semantic evolution took place with *diasprum*, from Greek *diaspron* "double white", presumably pointing to the dyeing of the cloth in a double white bath, or to a two-tone white cloth; however, *diasprum* lost this specific meaning and by the tenth century was the denomination of a type of silk textile known in the West.⁽³⁹⁾ *Cendatum* and variants such as *cindatum* and *cendalum*, or sendal, are documented in the West since the first half of the ninth century.⁽⁴⁰⁾ The name of this fabric deri-

(32) For some of these textiles, see A. Muthesius, *A Practical Approach to the History of Byzantine Silk Weaving*, in "Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik", 34 (1984), pp. 235-254; eadem, *Silken Diplomacy*, in J. Shepard and S. Franklin (eds.), *Byzantine Diplomacy. Papers from the Twenty-Fourth Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Cambridge, March 1990*, Aldershot (Hampshire), 1992, pp. 237-248.

(33) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 466-467, 488-500; however, on p. 491, l. 12, in n. 220, and on p. 500, l. 23, instead of 'hyperpers', read 'nomismata'.

(34) Aelii Lampridii, *Antoninus Heliogabalus*, cap. 26, in E. Hohl (ed.), *Scriptores historiae Augustae* (Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum, Teubneriana), Lipsiae, 1965, I, p. 242: *prius Romanorum holoserica veste usus fertur*; also *Codex Theodosianus*, XV, 9.

(35) Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, I, p. 363: *olosiricum*, and II, p. 4: *veste alba olosirica*, at Rome respectively in the time of Benedict II (684-685) and Leo III (795-816).

(36) *Wandaberti Miracula S. Goaris*, ed. O. Holder-Egger, *MGH*, SS, XV/1, Hannoveriae, 1887, pp. 367 and 370.

(37) *Codex Theodosianus*, X, 21, 3; Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, I, p. 271.

(38) As color: Steigerwald, *Die Purpursorten*, pp. 223-253; *Gesta abbatum Fontanellensium* (as above, n. 9). On the semantic evolution in Byzantium, see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 458, n. 29; in the West: Duchesne, *Le Liber Pontificalis*, II, p. 13: *leconblatea*, or *leukon blattion*, 'white silk textile', under Leo III (795-816); *MGH, Die Briefe der deutschen Kaiserzeit. IV. Die Briefe des Petrus Damiani*, ed. K. Reindel, München, 1983-1993, I, p. 149, l. 23, no. 14. See also a Genoese document of 1201 explaining that *panni serici blattia dicuntur*: *CDG*, III, p. 195.

(39) *Gesta pontificum Autissiodorensium*, ed. L.M. Duri, in *Bibliothèque historique de l'Yonne*, I, Auxerre, 1850, cap. 64, and above, n. 25, for *diaspitin*. See D. King, *Sur la signification de diasprum*, in "Bulletin de liaison du Centre international d'études des textiles anciens", 11 (1960), pp. 42-47, and for two-tone white, A. Muthesius, *The Byzantine Silk Industry: Lopez and beyond*, in "Journal of Medieval History", 19 (1993), p. 55; see also below, n. 60.

(40) See above, n. 9.

ved from Greek *sendes*, a term documented in tenth century Byzantium, rather than directly from the Arabic *sundus*, attested for the same period.⁽⁴¹⁾ Samite was known in the West as *examitum*, the Latin version of Greek *hexamiton*, "six-threaded" weave. We have noted that samite apparently reached the West since the eighth century,⁽⁴²⁾ yet the term *examitum* is apparently not documented in Italy before the eleventh century, though it must have been used earlier.⁽⁴³⁾ In 876 the bishop of Constance, Salomon II, sent as gift to Louis the German several overseas items, among them a piece of silk described as *polimitum*. The term, from Greek *polymiton* "multiple-threaded" weave, is already attested in Roman sources for woolens, yet was later applied to silks.⁽⁴⁴⁾ More complex is the case of *siglaton*, a silk fabric of Byzantine origin adorned with roundels enclosing birds, animals or designs, which was either monochrome or dyed in several colors. It is impossible to determine whether this fabric reached the Latin West from Byzantium or from Islamic Spain, as the cloth was manufactured in both these areas.⁽⁴⁵⁾ Indeed, the Arab geographer al-Idrīsī, who between 1139 and 1154 compiled in Palermo his *Kitāb Rudjar*, or "Book of Roger" records *siglaton* among the fabrics produced in Almeria before the city's conquest by the Christians in 1147.⁽⁴⁶⁾ It is also mentioned in the Castilian *Poema del Mio Cid*, the original version of which is dated to about 1140, and in Spanish documentary sources since about 1150.⁽⁴⁷⁾

Since the first half of the eleventh century the

Byzantine social élite and the urban middle stratum, the latter particularly in Constantinople, enjoyed an accumulation of wealth that generated changing consumption patterns and a growing inclination toward the display of luxury as a status symbol. The increasing demand for silks in this framework stimulated an expansion of the Empire's silk industry and a diversification of its products. The rise and development of new centers of silk manufacture in the western provinces of the Empire since the eleventh century, particularly at Thebes, Corinth and Patras, as well as in the islands of Andros and Euboea, was clearly oriented toward the supply of the Byzantine internal market. This trend was also illustrated, yet in a different way, by sericulture in Calabria, the expansion of which about the mid-eleventh century was largely geared to the supply of raw material to the Empire's manufacturers, primarily in Constantinople. By the twelfth century Thebes had become the major silk center in western Byzantium and competed successfully with Constantinople in the quality and sophistication of its products, which were highly valued by the imperial court, the West and the Seldjuks in Asia Minor. Yet the Byzantine silk industry also catered to a larger clientele and manufactured less expensive silk fabrics, including relatively cheap ones made of floss silk and half-silks combining silk with cotton. Since the second half of the eleventh century Venetian, and since the twelfth Genoese merchants were increasingly involved in the marketing of these silks within the Empire and in

(41) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 458-460.

(42) See above, n. 4.

(43) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 460 and n. 37; also above, n. 25.

(44) *MGH, Leges, Sectio V/1, Formulae Merovingici et Karolini Aevi*, ed. K. Zeumer, Hannoveriae, 1882, p. 415, n. 29: *palliolum coloris prasini et aliud polimitum*. On the Roman period, see M.-Th. Schmitter-Picard, *Sericarii*, in *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire offerts à Charles Picard à l'occasion de son 65^e anniversaire*, II, "Revue archéologique", 6^e série, 30 (1949), pp. 954-956. See also *demita* or *dimita* in a Genoese document of 1174: Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 461, n. 42.

(45) On this cloth, see references in Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 460, n. 36; G. Colin, *Latin sigillatus > roman siglaton et escarlât*, in "Romania", 56 (1930), pp. 178-182. On two colored Islamic *siglaton* in the early eleventh century, see S.D. Goitein (trans.), *Letters of Medieval Jewish Traders*, Princeton, N.J., 1973, p. 77.

(46) Trans. in Serjeant, *Islamic textiles*, p. 170. For a later reference to Almeria's silks, see below, n. 55.

(47) R. Menéndez Pidal, *Cantar del Mio Cid, Texto, gramática y vocabulario*, Madrid, 1944-1946, III, vv. 2574, 2721, 2739, 2744; documentary evidence: *ibid.*, II, pp. 573-574. See also D.W. Lomax, *The Date of the "Poema del Mio Cid"*, in A.D. Deyermond (ed.), *"Mio Cid" Studies*, London, 1977, pp. 73-81; the only extant manuscript of this work was executed in 1207.

their export to the West and the Levant.⁽⁴⁸⁾ Their acquaintance with Byzantine silks clearly promoted the latter's diffusion in the Latin West.

Yet the decisive factors in this respect appear to have been generated by some long-term economic and social processes, which spread from Italy to other areas of the West since the eleventh century. Some of these processes recall similar, yet earlier developments in Byzantium. Essentially they consisted in a sustained demographic growth, somewhat slowed down since the 1280s, the urban concentration of the population, a rise in purchasing power and in the standard of living and, finally, a refinement in daily life. All these features, which affected an ever larger section of the population, were furthered by the development of the western monetary economy. The rise in consumption is illustrated by the expansion of the western woolen and cotton industries, the diversification and refinement of their products, and the growing volume of internal trade in the latter since the twelfth century, an aspect somewhat neglected because of the focus of historians on long-distance commerce.⁽⁴⁹⁾ To be sure, silk textiles remained an expensive commodity, affordable to a limited clientele only, yet the number of customers was rising fast. The western commercial demand was no more restricted to rulers, members of the nobility, church dignitaries

and ecclesiastical institutions, as in the previous period. It also extended to townspeople.

It is against this background that we witness a progressive growth in western imports of eastern silk fabrics, beginning in the early eleventh century. Since 1071 at the latest up to the Fourth Crusade Venetian traders were continuously present in Thebes. Their activity in this inland city was related to the export of silk fabrics of various qualities as far as Constantinople in the east and Venice in the west. A century later, in 1171, Genoa failed in its attempt to gain access to the precious silk fabrics of Thebes, the marketing of which was controlled by the imperial government. However, by then the Genoese were already trading for several decades in other silks, including the samite and sendal produced in the Aegean island of Andros, and had thereby contributed to their diffusion in the West.⁽⁵⁰⁾ Literary works circulating among the western nobility such as the Castilian *Poema del mio Cid* of about 1140,⁽⁵¹⁾ as well as the *Roman de Troie*, composed by Benoît de Sainte-Maure about 1160, mention the sendal manufactured in Andros.⁽⁵²⁾ Samite without indication of origin also appears in German epic works, such as Hartmann von Aue's *Armen Heinrich*, composed about 1195.⁽⁵³⁾ *Tristan et Iseut*, composed by the Norman poet Bérout at the latest about 1180, refers to a piece of dark grey silk cloth brought from the city of Nicaea, located in northwestern Asia Minor.⁽⁵⁴⁾ In his *Erec et Enide*

(48) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, on Calabria, pp. 471, 475-476, 478, and on cheaper silks, pp. 473-475.

(49) There are numerous studies on woolens. On cotton textiles, see M.F. Mazzaoui, *The Italian Cotton Industry in the Later Middle Ages, 1100-1600*, Cambridge, 1981, pp. 59-126, 166-168.

(50) For what follows on Andros, the Venetians and the Genoese, see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 460-461, 466-467, 479, 491-492, 494-500; see also below, n. 57, evidence for about 1135, and M. Chiaudano, M. Moresco (eds.), *Il cartolare di Giovanni Scriba*, Torino, 1935, I, n. 47b (p. 25), *unam cooperturam de cendal vetera[m]*, in 1156.

(51) Menendez Pidal, *Cantar del Mio Cid*, v. 1, 971: *mantos e pieles [= pallia] e buenos çendales d'A[n]dria*.

(52) L. Constans (ed.), *Le Roman de Troie*, III, Paris, 1907, p. 276, vv. 19,968-19,969; for the dating, see G. Raynaud de Lage, in J. Frappier, R.R. Grimm (eds.), *Grundriss der romanischen Literatur IV: Le roman arthurien jusqu'à la fin du XIII^e siècle*, Heidelberg, 1978-1984, IV/1, pp. 178-180, and J. Frappier et R. de Lage, *ibid.*, pp. 145-148. On other western literary works referring to Andros, see also V. Crescini, *Çendales d'Adria*, in "Atti del R. Istituto veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti", in 76/2 (1917), pp. 914-915.

(53) See A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben zur Zeit der Minnesinger*,² Leipzig, 1889, I, pp. 332, 343-344; G. Taubert, *Erwähnung von Textilien in mittelhochdeutschen Epen*, in Flury-Lemberg und Stolleis, *Documenta Textilia*, pp. 14-15.

(54) S. Gregori (ed.), *The Romance of Tristan by Beroul*, Amsterdam, Atlanta, Ga., 1992, vv. 4125 and 4129: *Un drap de soie a paille bis/ (...) / Li dras fu achaté en Niques*. The suggested datings of this work vary between 1165-1170 and 1176-1180, while the manuscript belongs to the second half of the thirteenth century: see *ibid.*, pp. XXVII-XXIX and IX, respectively.

Chrétien de Troyes, a contemporary of Bérout, mentions a diasper fabric "made in Constantino-ple" and a silk cloth from Thessaly.⁽⁵⁵⁾ It is obvious that in these and many other cases the poets chose place names that fitted the required rhyme. However, in order to sound truthful and impress their audience they had to refer to fabrics that were known in the West, as duly attested by the Andros silks.

It is particularly noteworthy that since the first half of the eleventh century silk textiles also appear in Italian urban households, a clear indication of their widening market. A dowry provided in Gaeta in 1003 mentions a piece of sendal from Andros, while in 1021 a woman living in Bari owned a piece of sendal of unknown origin. In 1017 and 1048 newly-wed women in Bari received from their respective husband a kerchief made of silk or adorned with this material, among other marriage gifts. In 1025 an Amalfitan living in Naples willed to his daughter various pieces of silk, including two "Greek" kerchiefs, clearly of Byzantine origin.⁽⁵⁶⁾

In a letter written about 1135 preserved in a stylized version, a Genoese woman asked her husband, a merchant active at that time in Byzantium, to send her a piece of sendal and another

of samite, both manufactured in Andros. These silks were clearly intended for personal use, and not for sale, as we may gather from the enumeration of the other objects she requested.⁽⁵⁷⁾ Although quantitative data are totally lacking, the evidence adduced above clearly points to the growing western import and diffusion of Byzantine silks in the twelfth century.

The crusades, the existence of the Latin states in the Levant, and the increase in the flow of pilgrimage in the twelfth and particularly the thirteenth century enhanced western acquaintance with Near Eastern silk fabrics and stimulated their diffusion in the West.⁽⁵⁸⁾ Many silk fabrics (*oloserici*) and precious garments were included among the booty collected by the crusaders after their conquest of Antioch in 1098.⁽⁵⁹⁾ The city was a major manufacturer of silk fabrics, which pursued its activity in this field up to the end of the Latin period in 1268. In 1153 Venice obtained from the prince of Antioch, Reynald, a reduction of the dues on the export of the city's silk fabrics, which presumably included the *diasprum Antiochenum*, a type known in the West, as noted earlier.⁽⁶⁰⁾ About the same time the Arab geographer al-Idrīsī, who as noted above wrote between 1139 and

(55) Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec and Enide*, ed. and trans. by C.W. Carroll (Garland Library of Medieval Literature, Series A, 25), New York-London, 1987, vv. 96-97: *s'ot cote d'un diapre noble/ qui fu fez an Costantinoble*; vv. 2,369-2,370: *une coute de paille/ qui venue estoit de Tessaille*. The base manuscript of this edition belongs to the early thirteenth century. A silk fabric from Almeria appears in a digression included in an isolated contemporary version, quoted *ibid.*, p. 321, v. 2,361: *fu de soie d'Amaurie*.

(56) *Tabularium Casinense, Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus*, Montecassino, 1887-1892, II, p. 164, n. 275: *zendatum de Andre: Codice diplomatico barese*, ed. G.B. Nitto di Rossi e F. Nitti di Vito, Trani, 1897-1941, I, respectively p. 17, n. 10, p. 16, n. 9 and p. 38, n. 22 (*faciolum cum serico*); Capasso, *Monumenta ad Neapolitani Ducatus historiam pertinentia*, II/1, p. 252, n. 402 (*duas facciolas gricisca*, which appear among silken objects). In 1012 a Gaetan acting as guarantor for a house and a plot of land pledged silver, cotton and *du* [sic for *duo*] *panni de siricu negotiantile* [sic]: *Tabularium Casinense, Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus*, I, p. 233, n. 123, and p. 234, n. 124.

(57) W. Wattenbach (ed.), *Iter austriacum, 1853*, in "Archiv für Kunde österreichischer Geschichts-Quellen", 14 (1855), p. 80, n. XIX.

(58) On the growth of pilgrimage, see D. Jacoby, *Pèlerinage médiéval et sanctuaires de Terre Sainte: la perspective vénitienne*, in "Ateneo veneto", 173 (N.S. 24) (1986), pp. 27-31, repr. in Id., *Studies on the Crusader States and on Venetian Expansion*, Northampton, 1989, n. IV.

(59) Guillaume de Tyr, *Chronique*, 5, 23 and 6, 22, ed. R.B.C. Huygens (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, LIII-LIII A), Turnhout, 1986, pp. 303 and 337-338.

(60) TTh, I, p. 133. This type of cloth was also recorded later: see E. Molinier, *Inventaire du trésor du Saint Siège sous Boniface VIII (1295)*, in "BEC", 46 (1885), p. 25, n. 887; p. 33, n. 990: *de dyaspro violaceo*; and note esp. p. 29, n. 937: *unam tunicellam de diaspro albo antiocheno antiquam*, which may thus have been manufactured in Antioch more than a century earlier.

1154, reported that Antioch manufactured 'At-tābī, Dastuwa'ī or Tustarī Isfahānī silk garments, thus imitating silk and half-silk Iraqi and Persian textiles.⁽⁶¹⁾ This is not surprising, since Antioch had been under Islamic rule from 636/637 to 969 and again from 1084 to 1098. However, more than two centuries of Byzantine dominion, from 969 to 1084, appear to have also left their mark on Antioch's silk manufacture. By the first half of the thirteenth century Antioch's silk wimples or women's head coverings, presumably similar to the Byzantine kerchiefs common then in Egypt, and other items made of silk cloth were exported to Acre, either for local consumption or on their way to the West.⁽⁶²⁾ For several centuries the geographic position and historical fate of Antioch had apparently indu-

ced its silk workers to borrow weaves, designs and colors from both Byzantium and the Islamic Near East. The crusader conquest, the settlement of a fairly large Latin population in the Levant, and the intensification of trade between this region and the West added a vast new market for Antioch's own products and those reaching it from its Asian hinterland. Other Levantine centers of silk manufacture also seem to have benefited from these developments.

The booty collected by the Muslims after Šaladin's conquest of Acre in July 1187 included red *siglātūn*, or *siglaton*, a silk fabric we have already encountered.⁽⁶³⁾ It may be safely assumed that this was a foreign product, as silk manufacture is not attested by the fairly large number of sources bearing on twelfth and thirteenth century Acre. By the late twelfth century this city

(61) Trans. in Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles*, p. 114, and see n. 5; for the original products, see *ibid.*, pp. 28-29, 41-44, 82-85. Al-Idrīsī records the garments made of white cloth from Tyre, yet without specifying the latter's nature: trans. *ibid.*, p. 118. This cloth has been considered a silk fabric by W. Heyd, *Histoire du commerce du Levant au moyen âge*, Leipzig, 1885-1886, I, p. 179, and others following him. Significantly, though, the twelfth century bishop and chronicler William of Tyre, who was obviously well informed, mentions industrial activities, yet no silk manufacture in his description of the city: *Chronique*, 13, 3, ed. Huygens, I, pp. 589-590. The same holds true of thirteenth century Venetian sources, including the extensive survey of Venetian property and interests in Tyre and its rural hinterland, which mentions weavers without specifying the material they handled: O. Berggötz, *Der Bericht des Marsilio Zorzi. Codex Querini-Stampalia IV3 (1064)* (Kieler Werckstücke, Reihe C: Beiträge zur europäischen Geschichte des frühen und hohen Mittelalters, herausgegeben von Hans Eberhard Mayer, Band 2), Frankfurt am Main, 1990, pp. 135-171, and 140, 201, for the *texarini*; previous ed. in TTh, II, pp. 354-388. Heyd (as above) seems to imply that Tyre continued to dye fabrics with murex purple and refers to Benjamin of Tudela as his source, yet the Jewish traveller does not record purple in his description of the city. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 161, claims that murex purple was among the products of crusader Tyre. However, in his survey of Tyre's ancient history William of Tyre (*Chronique*, 13, 1, ed. Huygens, I, p. 584) mentions that murex purple dyeing was first applied there, hence even in his own days purple-dyed fabrics were called 'tyria', yet he does not refer to the pursuit of this activity in his time. On *tyria*, see above, n. 5. Nevertheless, in the twelfth and thirteenth century Egyptian fishers, including Jews, still collected the murex mollusk along the Levantine coast: see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 493. On raw silk in relation to Tyre, see below.

(62) Comte Beugnot (ed.), *Livre des Assises de la Cour des Bourgeois*, in *Recueil des historiens des croisades, Lois*, II, Paris, 1843, p. 179, par. 8: *de la robe que aportent les marchans d'Antioche, si coume sont guimples et messares, et autres euvres qui sont de sée labourées et de fil*, thus also silk yarn. The extant version of the *Livre* was compiled in the 1260s: see J. Riley-Smith, *The Feudal Nobility and the Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1174-1277*, London, 1973, pp. 85 and 268, n. 186, yet the custom tariff was clearly older. I have been unable to determine the meaning of *messares*, but assume the word stands for other pieces of mercery. On the latter, see Pegolotti, p. 419, s.v. Fregi. On silken kerchiefs of the *Rūmī* type in Egyptian dowries, see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, p. 46, and IV, pp. 167, 191, yet *mandil Rūmī* was not a European, but a Byzantine kerchief. It would seem that Goitein was not aware that Arabic *mandīl* derived from medieval Greek *mandelion* or *mantelion*, i.e. napkin, kerchief, and not from a Latin root: see E.A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine period (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100)*, Cambridge, 1914, p. 732; an example in a Greek inventory: Ch. Diehl, *Le trésor et la bibliothèque de Patmos au commencement du 13^e siècle*, "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", I (1892), p. 514. In Egypt the expensive silk kerchiefs must have been imported, while the cheaper ones were presumably local imitations of Byzantine weaves and designs; some of them were made of linen in Tinnis: see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, IV, pp. 167, 191.

(63) Ibn al-Athīr, *Histoire des Atabecs de Mosul*, in *Recueil des Historiens des Croisades, Historiens orientaux*, I, Paris, 1872, p. 689. On this cloth, see above, n. 45.

was the most important market of the crusader Levant, catering to the needs of its own population and those of the numerous Westerners visiting it. In addition, Acre also became the main depot and transshipment station for Near Eastern commodities collected along the Levantine coast and intended for export to the West.⁽⁶⁴⁾ It is in this period that Arabic terms entered the western silk terminology. Silk textiles from Baghdad appearing as *panni de Bagadello* were shipped in 1160 from Genoa to Valencia and others to Ceuta.⁽⁶⁵⁾ *Tristan et Iseut*, composed by the Norman poet Béroul at the latest about 1180, refers to silk fabrics brought from Baghdad,⁽⁶⁶⁾ and a document of 1197 mentions various silk fabrics, among them one *de baldekino*, the name of which was derived from this city.⁽⁶⁷⁾ On the other hand, a precious cloth from Alexandria, *riche paisle d'Alixandré*, appears in *Erec et Enide*.⁽⁶⁸⁾

The thirteenth century evidence on western imports of silks from the Levant is more abundant. A Genoese charter of 1212 mentions *purpura una de Ultramaré*.⁽⁶⁹⁾ In 1222 a Genoese re-

ceived a piece of *cendati grane obertini* [sic] *de Ultramaré*, or a kermes-dyed sendal, and two pieces of purple silk cloth, most likely manufactured in Tripoli, like the camlet mentioned in the same document.⁽⁷⁰⁾ Some 4,000 looms producing silks and camlet, precisely the fabrics mentioned in the Genoese charter just adduced, were operating in the city in 1289, when it was con- *
quered by the Muslims.⁽⁷¹⁾ By 1222 the Venetians were purchasing silk and silk fabrics in Beirut.⁽⁷²⁾ The Venetian maritime statutes of 1233 and 1255 mention the shipping of these same commodities from the Levant, without referring to specific cities.⁽⁷³⁾ It is clear, though, that Acre was among them. In 1239 an agent of Frederick II bought there pieces of sendal, the provenance of which is not stated.⁽⁷⁴⁾ In 1236 merchants from Marseilles, Montpellier and other Provençal cities, who were exporting silk and silk fabrics from the Seljuk Sultanate of Iconium and the Levant, obtained from King Henry I of Cyprus a reduction of dues imposed on the transit of these and other commodities through

(64) D. Jacoby, *L'évolution urbaine et la fonction méditerranéenne d'Acre à l'époque des croisades*, in E. Poleggi (ed.), *Città portuali del Mediterraneo, storia e archeologia. Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Genova 1985*, Genova, 1989, p. 100. *

(65) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), I, nos. 626, 771. A load of *indici de Bagadello* is sent from Genoa to Palermo in 1161: *ibid.*, II, n. 1004. Pegolotti, pp. 33, 78, 87, 207, 295, 305-306, 371, mentions *indaco baccadeo*, *di Baldacca*, *di Gabbadeo*.

(66) Gregory, *The Romance of Tristan by Beroul* (see above, n. 54), vv. 3,903-3,904: *La roïne out de soie dras. / Aporté furent de Baudas*.

(67) F. Ughelli (ed.), *Italia sacra*, 2nd ed. by N. Nicoletti, Venetiis, 1717-1722, VII, B.275. For additional references see Francisque-Michel, *Recherches sur le commerce, la fabrication et l'usage des étoffes de soie, d'or et d'argent et autres tissus précieux en Orient et en Occident, principalement en France pendant le Moyen Age*, Paris, 1852-1854, I, pp. 91-94, 102; A. Schultz, *Das höfische Leben*, I, pp. 332, 336.

(68) Chrétien de Troyes, *Erec and Enide*, v. 1981.

(69) R. Doehard (ed.), *Les relations commerciales entre Gênes, la Belgique et l'Outremont*, Bruxelles-Rome, 1941, II, n. 342.

(70) A. Ferretto (ed.), *Liber magistri Salmonis (1222-1226)*, in "Atti della Società ligure di storia patria", 36 (1906), n. 398. *Grana* or kermes was a high-quality, solid scarlet colorant obtained from an insect and only used for the dyeing of high-grade yarns: see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 483.

(71) Al-Makrizi, *Histoire des sultans mamelouks de l'Égypte*, ed. and trans. M.E. Quatremère, Paris, 1837-1845, II/1, p. 103. Burchard of Mount Sion, who visited the Levant between 1280 and 1283, mentions Tripoli's silk industry without providing any figure: J.M.C. Laurent (ed.), *Peregrinationes medii aevi quatuor: Burchardus de Monte Sion, Ricoldus de Monte Crucis, Odoricus de Foro Julii, Wilbrandus de Oldenborg*, Lipsiae, 1864, p. 28; for the dating, see A. Grabois, *Christian pilgrims in the thirteenth century and the Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem: Burchard of Mount Sion*, in B.Z. Kedar, H.E. Mayer, R.C. Smail (eds.), *Outremer. Studies in the History of the Kingdom of Jerusalem*, presented to Joshua Prawer, Jerusalem, 1972, pp. 287-288.

(72) TTh, II, p. 233: *seta et opera sete*.

(73) R. Predelli e A. Sacerdoti (eds.), *Gli statuti marittimi veneziani fino al 1255*, Venezia, 1903, p. 73, para. 2, and p. 161, para. CV: *seta et opera sete*.

(74) J.L.A. de Huillard-Bréholles (ed.), *Historia diplomatica Frederici secundi*, Parisiis, 1852-1861, V, p. 587: *emptos fuisse in Acon ad opus curie nostre pannos de lana, bucaranos; cendatos et camellatos*.

the island.⁽⁷⁵⁾ A French poem composed about 1260 describes Lucca as "adorned with precious fabrics of outremer", or the Levant, "that were so beautiful and expensive, that in the whole world they have no equal".⁽⁷⁶⁾ The reference of the author to the use of Levantine silks in Lucca is rather puzzling and either rests on a misunderstanding, or simply is a figment of his imagination. Indeed, by that time Lucca's silk industry was producing precious and sophisticated silks on a large scale and it is excluded, therefore, that the city should have imported Levantine silks, let alone be decorated with them.⁽⁷⁷⁾

Two more regions closer to the West warrant our attention. Sericulture was practiced in Southern Italy in the late tenth and the eleventh century in the Principality of Benevento, the areas of Naples and Volturno, and on a fairly large scale on Byzantine territory.⁽⁷⁸⁾ As noted above, its expansion in Calabria about the mid-eleventh century was largely geared to the export of silk to Byzantine manufacturers further east. The Norman conquest of Southern Italy, completed by 1071, did not sever this region's commercial links with Byzantium. To be sure, to some extent the recurrent tension between the Normans and the Empire must have hampered trade relations between them. It may be safely assumed, though, that Southern Italy continued to supply the Empire in silk until new economic developments in the West, examined below, diverted the export of this commodity to other destinations.⁽⁷⁹⁾ The export

of raw material must have restricted the output of the indigenous industry, about which we have only sparse information. It is possible that Oria and some other Apulian cities produced silks in the tenth century. If we are to believe some twelfth and thirteenth century French *chansons de geste*, this also was the case in Otranto, which presumably pursued an activity begun earlier.⁽⁸⁰⁾ A silk fabric manufactured at Gaeta is duly attested in 1028.⁽⁸¹⁾ Despite some export, it would seem that the industry of Southern Italy primarily supplied the regional demand for silks. As for Muslim Sicily, it produced silk, partly exported, and manufactured silk fabrics varying in quality, including expensive ones, part of which were shipped to Egypt, the Maghreb and Islamic Spain.⁽⁸²⁾ In any event, the varied products of both Southern Italy and Sicily were clearly inferior in quality to high-grade Byzantine and Islamic silks.

This is confirmed by some twelfth century developments in the Norman kingdom of Sicily, which comprised both these regions. There is good reason to believe that the red samite fabric of the coronation mantle of King Roger II, used in 1128, as well as some other royal silks now preserved in Vienna, originated in Thebes. We have already noted the importance of this city's silk production in the twelfth century. The acquaintance of the Norman court with Byzantine silks, in particular those of Thebes, goes far to explain the policy adopted by King Roger II in Greece with respect to silk manufacture. After occupying The-

(75) H.E. Mayer, *Marseilles Levantehandel und ein akkonensisches Fälscheratelier des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Bibliothek des Deutschen Historischen Instituts in Rom, Band XXXVIII), Tübingen, 1972, p. 194: *de la terre del sultan de Come o d'autre part deca mer (...) de chacune rote de soie (...) et de draps de soie*.

(76) *Lueque se fait atorer/ De chières roubles d'outremer./ Qui tant estoit et bèle et rice/ Qu'en tot le mont n'ont cèle bisse*, in *Li biaux desconneus*, quoted in V. Gay, *Glossaire archéologique du moyen âge et de la Renaissance*, Paris, 1887-1928, I, p. 573. I have not had access to the edition by A. Pucci, *Canzone ai Lucchesi*, Lucca, 1868.

(77) See below, pp. 57 and *passim*.

(78) Guillou, *La soie du katépanat*, pp. 74-75.

(79) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 478-479, 497-498. Guillou, *La soie du katépanat*, p. 84, wrongly assumes an interruption of trade following the Norman conquest.

(80) *Ibid.*, p. 79.

(81) *Tabularium Casinense, Codex diplomaticus Cajetanus*, II, pp. 298-299, n. 153: *fondata serica bona gaytanisca*.

(82) Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 463-464.

bes and Corinth in 1147, the Norman forces abducted the Greek and Jewish silk workers of these cities, both male and female, who were apparently integrated within the existing royal silk workshop at Palermo. The deportation involved a major technological transfer from Byzantium to Norman Sicily. The transplanted workers substantially raised the quality of the silk textiles produced up till then in the island, and imparted their skills to local workers. However, their manufacture of high-grade silks imitating Byzantine weaves, designs and colors seems to have been mainly, if not exclusively intended for royal consumption.⁽⁸³⁾ Many, if not all the numerous garments made of purple silk found at the king's palace of Palermo in 1161 were most likely products of the royal workshop, in which Muslim embroiderers continued to work.⁽⁸⁴⁾ In a letter written in 1190 Hugo Falcandus provides an impressive picture of the variety of silk fabrics of Byzantine types produced in this atelier.⁽⁸⁵⁾ After capturing Palermo in 1194 Henry VI of Hohenstaufen took hold

of the treasury of his Norman predecessors, which included royal silk vestments that were later used at the coronation ceremonies of the German emperors.⁽⁸⁶⁾

Silk manufacture in Sicily presumably continued also outside the royal workshop. The treaty of 1162 between Frederik I and Genoa refers to coins, bullion and silk fabrics handled by the Genoese in the island.⁽⁸⁷⁾ Silken garments, the provenance of which is unknown, were being sold by Amalfitan merchants at Palermo in 1189 and seized by Pisans in a Genoese warehouse at Messina in 1194.⁽⁸⁸⁾ It is not excluded that some of these commodities had been locally manufactured, while others were imports. However, it would seem that apart from the supply of the royal court in silk fabrics, the Norman rulers saw no reason to stimulate silk manufacture in their kingdom.⁽⁸⁹⁾ They apparently preferred the export of raw materials over that of finished products, since it generated more income for their treasury.⁽⁹⁰⁾

(83) On the deportation and its consequences: *ibid.*, pp. 464-466. It has been suggested, recently anew, that the description of the three hundred virgins toiling in a weaving workshop appearing in *Yvain*, a work of the second half of the twelfth century by Chrétien de Troyes, is a reference to the deportees in Palermo: K.N. Ciggaar, *Chrétien de Troyes et la "matière byzantine": les demoiselles du Château de Pesme Aventure*, in "Cahiers de civilisation médiévale", 32 (1989), pp. 325-331. Y.G. Lepage, *Encore les trois cents pucelles (Chrétien de Troyes, Yvain, v. 5298-5324)*, *ibid.*, 34 (1991), pp. 159-166, considers the depiction fanciful. One might add to his arguments that *Yvain* does not mention silk weaving and that both in Greece and at Palermo men were employed alongside women in this activity, on which see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 467-468, 485-488.

(84) G.B. Siragusa (ed.), *La Historia o Liber de Regno Sicilie e la epistola ad Petrum Panormitanum ecclesie thesaurarium di Ugo Falcandus* (Fonti per la storia d'Italia, 22), Roma, 1897, p. 56: *purpuris vestesque regias*. A Muslim embroiderer is attested in 1184: R.J.C. Broadhurst (trans.), *The Travels of Ibn Jubayr*, London, 1952, p. 341.

(85) Letter of Hugo Falcandus in Siragusa, *La Historia*, pp. 178-180: *amita, dimita, triamita, examita, diarodon, diapisti*, the latter being *diaspri*. Significantly, all these weaves had Greek names. It is noteworthy that the imperial silk factory of Constantinople similarly produced a wide range of products: see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 474.

(86) See above, n. 83.

(87) *CDG*, I, p. 398.

(88) Letter of Hugo Falcandus in Siragusa, *La Historia*, p. 183; L.T. Belgrano e C. Imperiale di Sant'Angelo (eds.), *Annali genovesi di Caffaro e de' suoi continuatori*, Roma, 1890-1929, II, p. 49.

(89) E. Kislinger, *Demenna und die byzantinische Seidenproduktion*, in "Byzantinoslavica", 54 (1993), pp. 46-47, 49-51, considers it 'logical' that Roger II should have settled Jewish silk workers abducted from Greece at San Marco d'Alunzio, where they supposedly joined local Jewish silk workers. However, no sources are adduced to support this hypothesis, and the presence of Jews at San Marco at a later period does not prove their involvement in silk production, definitely not in the period covered here. It should be stressed that al-Idrisi mentions the production of much raw silk in the countryside of San Marco, thus hinting at the Val Demenna, without referring to silk fabrics: P.A. Jaubert (trans.), *Géographie d'Edrisi*, Paris, 1836, II, p. 80. This is in accord with the Jewish documents dealing with this area, on which see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 463, n. 60. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, IV, p. 193 and 416, n. 319, only mentions Demenna carpets possibly made of silk.

(90) D. Abulafia, *The Two Italies. Economic Relations between the Norman Kingdom of Sicily and the Northern Communes*, Cambridge, 1977, pp. 217-219, 255-256; *Id.*, *The Crown and the Economy under Roger II and his Successors*, in "Dunbarton Oaks Papers", 37 (1983), pp. 7-8, repr. in *Id.*, *Italy, Sicily and the Mediterranean, 1100-1400*, London, 1987, n. 1.

The Fourth Crusade and the dismemberment of the Byzantine Empire or Romania in 1204 had a major impact on the long-term economic evolution of the territories bordering the Eastern Mediterranean and the Black Sea. They opened these territories to western merchants and capital on a scale unknown earlier, and generated a restructuring of their production and trade patterns. This was particularly the case in the former western provinces of the Empire, some of which remained under Latin rule for more than two centuries. Their economy, previously oriented toward Constantinople, was henceforth closely integrated within a trade network primarily geared toward the West.⁽⁹¹⁾ With respect to silk, two developments deserve our attention. First, the Latin conquest resulted in the collapse of the centralized system of imperial control over the production and marketing of expensive silk textiles, apparently maintained both in Constantinople and the Empire's provinces up to the early thirteenth century.⁽⁹²⁾ Secondly, the political and territorial fragmentation of Latin Romania since 1204 prevented the restoration of this control system. The existence side by side of numerous small political entities created a climate of economic competition between them. None of their Latin lords could afford to limit western access to the silk fabrics produced on his own territory, nor restrict their distribution, as there were good chances that western merchants would supply themselves elsewhere. In order to increase their fiscal revenue, it was thus in the best interest of these lords to open their territories to western merchants and encourage their trade in silk textiles, as well as their involvement in the latter's manufacture.

The former western provinces of Byzantium which had come under Latin rule pursued the manufacture of silk textiles in the thirteenth century. In 1209 both the lord of Frankish Morea, Geoffrey I of Villehardouin, and the lord of Euboea or Negroponte, Ravano dalle Carceri, pledged that each year they and their successors would deliver pieces of gold-interwoven silk to Venice. The following year the archbishop of Patras, Antelmus, made a similar promise to the abbot of Cluny.⁽⁹³⁾ The commercial export of these high-grade fabrics to the West is duly attested at a later period. Yet the Peloponnese also manufactured cheaper rough fabrics made of spun silk. This cloth, known by its Greek name *koukoulariko*, was included for instance in the cargo of a Venetian ship about to sail from Nauplia to Apulia in 1273.⁽⁹⁴⁾

Western penetration in Latin Romania was not restricted to trade. It also extended to the manufacturing of silk fabrics. This is illustrated by the treaty concluded in 1240 between Genoa and the lord of Athens, Guy I of La Roche, whose territory included Thebes, a major center of silk manufacture in the twelfth century, as noted above. The treaty of 1240 does not refer to any administrative impediments of Genoese purchases of certain types of silks, since those enforced in Thebes in the Byzantine period had clearly been lifted. The main concern of the Genoese was the reduction of custom dues on their exports of silk textiles. Guy I of La Roche refused to yield to their demand and insisted that the Genoese pay the same amount as other merchants. The export of silk fabrics from Thebes was thus not exclusively in Genoese hands. Yet the treaty of 1240 also reveals that the Ge-

* (91) D. Jacoby, *From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change*, in "Mediterranean Historical Review", 4 (1989), pp. 28-29; also published with same pagination in B. Arbel, B. Hamilton and D. Jacoby (eds.), *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean after 1204*, London, 1989.

(92) See above, p. 54 and *passim*.

(93) See Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 469.

(94) TTh, III, p. 275: *cocularios*. On this type of cloth, see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 474 and n. 118. For the dating of the case, see G. Morgan, *The Venetian Claims Commission of 1278*, in "Byzantinische Zeitschrift", 69 (1976), p. 429, n. 60, and the note to this document on p. 437, yet the date is stated according to Venetian style and in fact refers to 1273.

noese were deeply involved in the local manufacturing process, as Guy I refers to silk fabrics woven by them or woven by others for them on his territory, a distinction of major importance.⁽⁹⁵⁾ It is practically excluded that Genoese artisans should have settled in Thebes and have directly participated in its silk manufacturing, since it would have been difficult, if not impossible for them to integrate into the high-grade silk production of this city. Moreover, had they nevertheless worked and perfected their skills in Thebes, one would have expected a contemporary development and improvement in silk manufacture in Genoa itself, of which there is no trace.⁽⁹⁶⁾

It follows that the Genoese described as manufacturing silks in Thebes in fact fulfilled another role. They apparently acted as entrepreneurs who, in conformity with common practice, financed the activity of a number of local silk workshops producing cloth exclusively for them. They presumably provided these workshops with silk, cocoons, and dyes or else advanced capital to purchase these raw materials and pay the workers' wages, receiving the finished products in return. In addition, the Genoese purchased silk textiles from other Theban workshops without financing their operation. In both cases, though, they must have specified the weaves, designs and colors of the fabrics they commissioned, in order to ensure

that they be attuned to the taste of their own prospective customers in the West and thus be easily marketable. Most likely the Genoese entrepreneurship entailed the temporary or even permanent settlement of some merchants in Thebes. This is also suggested by the presence of a Genoese consul in the city, attested by the treaty of 1240. Incidentally, the relationship of the Genoese entrepreneurs with the workshops of Thebes recalls to some extent the attitude of the Byzantine imperial court in the twelfth century, which ordered specific fabrics for its own ceremonial, political and diplomatic uses. Given the circumstances in Thebes about 1240, one could consider the textiles either as woven or "composed" by the Genoese themselves. In any event, the Genoese entrepreneurship implied a much deeper involvement in Theban silk economics than the Venetian one prior to 1171, since the Venetians were then restricted to the purchase of silk fabrics.⁽⁹⁷⁾ In fact, the Genoese entrepreneurs had taken over the economic role fulfilled prior to 1204 by some Greek *archontes*, members of the local elite.⁽⁹⁸⁾ They also filled a void left by the Frankish lords established in Thebes after the Latin conquest who, imbued with knightly values, abstained from direct involvement in the urban economy, in contrast to their Byzantine predecessors.⁽⁹⁹⁾ Nor were the remaining Greek *archontes* living under Frankish rule capable of competing with the Genoese en-

(95) *Liber iurium Reipublicae Genuensis*, I (Historiae patriae monumenta, VII), Augustae Taurinorum, 1854, col. 992-993, n. 757: *de pannis sericis ab eisdem Ianuensibus vel pro eis in terra nostra textis seu compositis, ipsi Ianuenses nobis solvere teneantur id quod ab aliis exigi solitum est et haberi*. E. Basso, *Le relazioni fra Genova e gli stati latini di Grecia nei secoli XIII-XIV*, in F. Fuidi, L. Valmarin (eds.), *Studi balcanici*, pubblicati in occasione del VI Congresso internazionale dell'Associazione internazionale d'Etudes Sud-Est Européennes, 1989, Roma, 1989, p. 23, assumes that *seta di Romania* mentioned in 1269 was a Theban fabric, yet the reference is to raw silk, the exact provenance of which is not stated.

(96) The recent study by P. Spagiari, *Cartulari notarili e produzione serica a Genova nel XIII secolo*, in the catalogue *Seta a Genova, 1491-1991*, Genova, 1991, pp. 13-17, is unfortunately marred by numerous misreadings and erroneous interpretations of documents and therefore unreliable. I will return to this subject elsewhere.

(97) One may wonder whether the obligation of the Genoese to pay the same customs dues as others (see above, n. 95) was related to the nature of the silks, or whether it hints at non-Genoese assuming a similar financial involvement in manufacture.

(98) On whom see Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, pp. 476-480, 492.

(99) On the Frankish lords, see D. Jacoby, *Knightly Values and Class Consciousness in the Crusader States of the Eastern Mediterranean*, in "Mediterranean Historical Review", 1 (1986), pp. 158-186, repr. in Id., *Studies*, n. 1; on Thebes in particular, see pp. 169-170. The attitude of the knights with respect to economic involvement changed later, in the fourteenth century.

trepreneurs, who had the advantage of handling liquid capital on a larger scale than the local lords and of being familiar with the western network of silk marketing.⁽¹⁰⁰⁾

The silk-related activity of the Genoese merchants and entrepreneurs in Thebes must have begun many years before 1240, since the treaty of that year renewed a previous agreement. Obviously, the Genoese considered it highly profitable to take advantage of the skills of the Theban silk workers and to export their high-quality finished products to the West, included there among the *panni de Romania* registered in notarial documents and inventories.⁽¹⁰¹⁾ However, since their presence in Thebes is not documented at a later period, we must assume that it ceased some time after 1240.⁽¹⁰²⁾ It is likely that at Genoa the Theban silks could not withstand in the long run the competition of the sophisticated fabrics manufactured at Lucca.⁽¹⁰³⁾ Moreover, it would seem that over time the export of raw materials from Greece to the expanding silk centers of the West became more lucrative than the marketing of fabrics.⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ There is no evidence to suggest that Genoese merchants or entrepreneurs fulfilled any role in the transfer of silk technology from Thebes to Italy.⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ Nor do we know whether foreign entrepreneurs conducted operations similar to those of the Genoese in Thebes or elsewhere in the former Byzantine provinces.

The increasing imports from the Eastern Mediterranean in the twelfth century did appa-

rently not satisfy the rapidly growing demand for silks in the West. It should be stressed that the expansion of this demand occurred precisely in a period witnessing a similar process in Byzantium, which must have necessarily restricted the Empire's exports of silk fabrics. Nor did the flow of silks from the Levant, it would seem, meet Western needs. Because of their Eurocentric approach, modern historians generally assume that the twelfth and thirteenth century Levant exported the bulk of its industrial products to the West, and that this was particularly the case with the Latin states in the region. It is obvious, though, that many of these products were absorbed by the huge Asian hinterland, primarily those manufactured in accordance with the latter's demand, such as the Islamic silks produced in Antioch, already mentioned above. The contribution of Southern Italy and Sicily to the western market was impaired by other factors. We have already noted their limited manufacturing capacity of these regions and, in any event, their silk products were apparently of lower standard than those coming from Romania and the Levant, except when manufactured in the royal workshop at Palermo. These general circumstances go far to explain a major development in the provisioning of the western market. Simultaneously with the continuing import of eastern silk textiles, the twelfth century witnessed the rise of an indigenous silk industry in continental Italy. Various explanations have

* (100) The *archontes* of Thebes were among those who welcomed the Latin emperor Henry when he entered Thebes in 1209: Henri de Valenciennes, *Histoire de l'empereur Henri de Constantinople*, ed. J. Longnon, Paris, 1948, para. 672. This implies that involvement in silk manufacture, despite their diminished resources. On the Frankish policy toward these *archontes*, see D. Jacoby, *The Encounter of Two Societies: Western Conquerors and Byzantines in the Peloponnese after the Fourth Crusade*, in "American Historical Review", 78 (1973), pp. 889-903, repr. in Id., *Recherches sur la Méditerranée orientale du XII^e au XV^e siècle. Peuples, sociétés, économies*, London, 1979, n. II.

(101) For instance, see Molinier, *Inventaire du trésor*, in "BEC", 46 (1885), p. 19, n. 816; p. 41, nos. 1108, 1114.

(102) By contrast, notarial charters attest Genoese activity in Chiarenza since the 1270s: see below, n. 149.

(103) On which, see below, p. 58 and *passim*.

(104) On these two issues, see below.

(105) On the absence of contemporary development in Genoa, see above. M.F. Mazzaoui, *Artisan Migration and Technology in the Italian Textile Industry in the Late Middle Ages (1100-1500)*, in R. Comba, G. Piccini, G. Pinto (eds.), *Strutture familiari, epidemie, migrazioni nell'Italia medievale*, Napoli, 1984, p. 524, rightly insists on the role of merchants and entrepreneurs in technology transfers.

been offered for the emergence of this industry, as well as for the origin of its skilled workers, industrial implements and technology. This is not the proper framework for a discussion of these vexing issues. The task is easier, though, with respect to the sources and varieties of raw materials upon which western silk manufacturers relied. By contrast to the wide diffusion of silk textiles, raw materials were channeled to a small number of specific locations. It is impossible to undertake here a full investigation of the supply networks supporting them. Instead, we will focus on those providing silk to Lucca, the first city to produce silks on an industrial scale and for a long time their leading producer in the Latin West.⁽¹⁰⁶⁾

It is common belief that a silk industry was operating in Lucca by the second half of the eleventh century, as the German romance *Ruodlieb*, composed in that period, mentions the purchase of silken ribbons in the city.⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ While their domestic production is not excluded, it is obvious that the manufacture of silk fabrics required a large and steady supply of raw silk of superior quality, sophisticated looms, and highly skilled workers. There was no sericulture in Lucca's vicinity, and hardly any in Central and Northern Italy in the twelfth and thirteenth

century. The attempts to promote it, as in the area of Bologna, appear to have been rather unsuccessful. Since 1284 we find in Lucca some *seta lombarda di fregio*, Lombard silk apparently produced in small quantities and used for friezes only, presumably because of its low quality. Similarly, the silk reeled from cocoons and the floss silk originating in the countryside of Modena that arrived in Lucca in 1294 were not suitable for the manufacture of high-grade fabrics. Lucchese raw silk does not appear on the market before 1335, and even later the city mainly relied on foreign produce.⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ It is obvious, therefore, that as an inland city Lucca heavily depended on maritime transportation for its provisioning in raw silk and high-grade dyes, which were Mediterranean commodities. The evidence in this respect, available since 1157, provides an approximate date for the initial phase of the Lucchese silk industry. This date is seemingly supported by the absence of any reference to silks in the treaty of 1153 between Lucca and Genoa.⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ In any event, an impressive development of Lucca's silk industry took place in the following decades, since by the early thirteenth century its fabrics had already established their reputation. *

(106) Numerous studies dealing with the Lucchese silk industry or referring to it include unwarranted reconstructions of the early stage of its development. F. Edler de Roover, *Lucchese Silks*, in "Ciba Review", 80 (1950), pp. 2902-2930, has given wide credence to some of them, as illustrated by various studies since hers. A thorough investigation of the subject is still wanting.

(107) Guillou, *La soie du katépanat*, pp. 75-76, rightly criticizes the prevailing view in this respect, expressed for instance by Ch. Meek, *The Trade and Industry of Lucca in the Fourteenth Century*, in "Historical Studies. Papers read before the Irish Conference of Historians", VI (1968), p. 42.

(108) See T. Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia. Alcuni studi sopra i secoli XIII e XIV*, Lucca, 1853, I, pp. 42-44, 51; S. Bongi, *Della mercatura dei Lucchesi nei secoli XIII e XIV*, Lucca, 1858, pp. 30-32, 35; Guillou, *La soie du katépanat*, pp. 74-75; for the area of Bologna, see M.F. Mazzaoui, *The Emigration of Veronese Textile Artisans to Bologna in the thirteenth century*, in "Atti e memorie della Accademia di agricoltura, scienze e lettere di Verona", serie VI, 19 (1967-1968), p. 6, n. 13, and F. Battistini, *La gelsibachicoltura e la struttura della seta in Toscana (secc. XIII-XVIII)*, in S. Cavaciocchi (ed.), *La seta in Europa, secc. XIII-XX* (Istituto Internazionale di Storia Economica "F. Datini", Prato, Serie II - Atti delle "Settimane di Studi" e altri Convegni, 24), Firenze, 1993, pp. 294-295; R.-H. Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux avec les pays d'Orient au moyen âge. Points de vue et documents*, in M. Mollat (ed.), *Sociétés et compagnies de commerce en Orient et dans l'Océan indien* (Actes du 8^e Congrès international d'histoire maritime, Beyrouth, 1966), Paris, 1970, p. 291, n. 1, claims without any explanation that the appellation *seta lombarda di fregio* refers to a silk type, and not to origin. On *fregio* or *frixium* as embroidery, see Molinier, *Inventaire du trésor*, in "BEC", 46 (1885), pp. 20-21, nos. 830-327, and p. 21, n. 1.

(109) For 1157, see below, p. 73, and for the treaty, below, n. 117.

A few examples will illustrate their wide diffusion, variety and sophistication. Genoese contracts drafted in 1201 mention the shipment of sendal to Provence, Montpellier and Barcelona, as well as to Sicily. In 1205 the Lucchese Rustichello Ganchi sailed to Messina with two pieces of yellow samite.⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Although the provenance of these fabrics is not stated, we may safely assume that they were manufactured in Lucca.⁽¹¹¹⁾ Indeed, in 1205 and 1206 the Lucchese Filippo Balbo sold numerous pieces *de cendatis grossis*, thirty of them in a single month to a Genoese draper, and a deal in gold thread among some Lucchese was also recorded in Genoa in this period.⁽¹¹²⁾ Moreover, Lucca's gold and silver-interwoven sendal, in addition to a simpler type of this cloth regularly reached Castile by the early thirteenth century, as implied by the list of maximum prices issued in

* 1207 by King Alfonso VII at the Cortes of Toledo.⁽¹¹³⁾ On a single day in 1234 the English court ordered 300 pieces of *cendalli de Lukes* to be bought on the London market.⁽¹¹⁴⁾ It is clear that many more pieces were available and that, in addition to the royal court, the Lucchese merchants had also other prospective customers in mind. About 1243 the emperor of Nicaea, John III Vatatzes, imposed on his subjects the exclusive use of indigenous silk textiles and prohibited the wear-

ring of clothes made of foreign silk fabrics. Since those manufactured in Italy were specifically mentioned in the imperial decree, we may be sure that by then Lucchese silks were reaching Asia Minor.⁽¹¹⁵⁾ It is also noteworthy that before 1231 silk workers in Milan and Modena had begun producing Lucchese types of silks, and in this same year the commune of Bologna attracted eighteen silk workers from the three cities, in return for extensive privileges and financial support. The fifteen workers from Lucca and Milan are uniformly described as *factores, laboratores et magistri cendatorum de Lucca*.⁽¹¹⁶⁾ All these testimonies imply that the Lucchese silk industry developed and produced high-grade fabrics much earlier than generally assumed and require a thorough reassessment of the hypothetical contribution of Sicilian silk workers to this process, generally dated to the thirteenth century.

The Lucchese silk industry would not have achieved an increase in output, nor a rise in the quality of its products without an adequate supply of silk and other raw materials, a subject to which hitherto no proper attention has been devoted. The close political relations between Genoa and Lucca since 1153 were of crucial importance in this respect and, more generally, for the development of the Lucchese silk industry.⁽¹¹⁷⁾ The exten-

(110) M.W. Hall-Cole, H.C. Krueger, R.G. Renert, R.L. Reynolds (eds.), *Notai liguri del sec. XII, V. Giovanni de Guiberto (1200-1211)*, Torino, 1939, I, nos. 178 (*peciam* [instead of *postam*] . *I. de cendatis*), 226 (*in cendatis*), 402 and 1103 (*xamitos . II. jalnos*).

(111) Earlier, in 1160, a merchant from Avignon took silken blankets from Genoa to Montpellier, and in 1179 the Lucchese Coena, based in Genoa, sent silk fabrics to Sicily: *Giovanni Scriba* (as above, n. 50), II, p. 308, no. XVI, and *ASG.*, *Sezione Manoscritti, Diversorum notariorum* [hereafter: *Mss.*], no. 102, fol. 21r. It is impossible to determine whether these silks were manufactured in Lucca.

(112) Giovanni de Guiberto (as above, n. 110), II, nos. 1439, 1686, 1796, and I, no. 1146. See also H.C. Krueger, R.L. Reynolds (eds.), *Notai liguri del sec. XII e del sec. XIII, VI. Lanfranco (1202-1226)*, Genova, 1953, I, no. 574, and II, no. 1353: a Lucchese delivering *unam peciam* [instead of *postam*] *cendati crossi et duas subtilles* in Genoa in 1210, and a deal involving *petias sex cendati de Luca* in 1225.

(113) F.J. Hernandez (ed.), "Las Cortes de Toledo de 1207", in *Las Cortes de Castilla y Leon en la Edad Media. Congreso científico sobre la historia de las Cortes de Castilla y Leon*, Valladolid, 1988, I, p. 241. The more expensive types of Lucchese sendal are indirectly attested by the entry following them: *El otro cendal de Luca*.

(114) See D. King, *Types of Silk Cloth used in England 1200-1500*, in Cavaciocchi, *La seta in Europa*, p. 458.

(115) L. Schopen, I. Bekker (eds.), *Nicephori Gregorae Historiae Byzantinae* (Corpus Scriptorum Historiae Byzantinae), Bonn, 1829-1854, I, pp. 43-44 (I.II.6). I will examine silk production in the Empire of Nicaea in a forthcoming study.

(116) See Mazzaoui, *The Emigration of Veronese Textile Artisans*, pp. 2-6, 40, 43-45, nos. 60, 67-69, 123-124, 127-135.

(117) The treaty of 1153 is the only one mentioning textiles, *pannos albos et blauos et apersatos*, clearly not silk fabrics: *CDG*, I, pp. 287-288.

sive commercial and maritime networks of Genoa throughout the Mediterranean turned this city into a depot and transit station for raw materials required by the Lucchese silk industry and, to some extent, also for the latter's finished products. The economic activity of the Lucchese in Genoa was partly related to silk. Since the 1180s a growing number of them settled in the Ligurian emporium, while maintaining close relations with Lucca.⁽¹¹⁸⁾ Not surprisingly, therefore, most relevant information about silk supplied to Lucca is to be found in Genoese and Lucchese notarial documents. In Genoa the series of notarial chartularies begins in 1155, though wide gaps exist for the following period. In Lucca some scattered evidence from 1220 and the following years has been preserved, yet the earliest extant chartulary of a local notary, which incidentally records several transactions in raw silk, is dated 1246.⁽¹¹⁹⁾ Moreover, numerous Genoese and Lucchese documents referring to silk fail to mention the latter's origin or quantity, simply stating that *tantam setam* has been handled by the parties to the registered contract.⁽¹²⁰⁾ The loss of earlier documentation, the fragmentary state of the extant sources and the incomplete nature of the information they offer on silk seriously impair any reconstruction of the early growth of Lucca's silk supply network.

It is noteworthy that the West imported some raw silk before the rise of its silk industry, presumably for embroidery or other domestic uses. The industrial production of textiles, however, required far larger amounts. The earliest evidence regarding silk in Genoa is at first glance disconcerting. In 1157 a mixed shipment from Genoa to Palermo included two loads of cocoons of unknown origin, one of them high-grade.⁽¹²¹⁾ In 1161 and 1163 we find instances of silk apparently imported to Genoa from Spain and forwarded to Bugia, Tunis and Alexandria, * respectively.⁽¹²²⁾ In 1162 a pound of high-grade expensive silk was shipped from Genoa to Valencia.⁽¹²³⁾ Silk of unknown provenance went to Sicily in 1161 and 1179, although this island was then a silk producer.⁽¹²⁴⁾ Despite these transaction, presumably determined by specific business considerations or the specific grade of the silk, we may safely assume that the bulk of the raw material imported in this period by Genoa was forwarded to Lucca. Sicily and Southern Italy were then the areas closest to Genoa in which silk was available. We have noted that before coming under Norman rule both these areas exported their surpluses to various destinations. They apparently continued to practice sericulture on a large scale in the twelfth century,

(118) G. Petti Balbi, *La presenza lucchese a Genova in età medioevale*, in R. Mazzei e T. Fanfani (ed.), *Lucca e l'Europa degli affari, secoli XV-XVII*, Lucca, 1990, pp. 29-35.

(119) R.S. Lopez, *The Unexplored Wealth of the Notarial Archives in Pisa and Lucca*, in *Mélanges d'histoire du Moyen Âge dédiés à la mémoire de Louis Halphen*, Paris, 1951, p. 422. A thorough exploration of Lucchese and Genoese notarial charters for evidence on silk is required.

(120) Nevertheless, it is sometimes possible to infer the provenance of the silk from earlier documents drafted by the same notary: see P. Racine, *Le marché génois de la soie en 1288*, in "Revue des études sud-est européennes", 8 (1970), pp. 405-406.

(121) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), I, no. 287: *cuculli optimi*. In each case the weight is stated, which excludes the explanation of the term as 'capuccio', suggested by the editors, II, p. 338. On trade in cocoons, even over long distances, see D. Jacoby, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese: the Evidence of Fourteenth Century Surveys and Reports*, in H. Kalligas (ed.), *Travellers and Officials in the Peloponnese. Descriptions - Reports - Statistics, in honour of Sir Steven Runciman*, Monemvasia, 1994, pp. 45-46, 53, 57, 60-61; Jacoby, *Silk in Western Byzantium*, p. 484, n. 183.

(122) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), II, nos. 812, 882, 1132. For the Spanish provenance, see convincing arguments in Schaubé, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 160, 284 and 286. The import of high-grade Spanish silk to Egypt is documented about a century earlier: see Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society*, I, p. 223.

(123) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), II, no. 1011: see Schaubé, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 322.

(124) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), II, no. 857. Despite some doubts expressed by Abulafia, *The Two Italies*, pp. 120-121, 219, the contract refers to silk (and not silk goods) to be delivered in Messina. For 1179: A.S.G., Mss., no. 102, fol. 18r, no. 2. Note in 1161 the shipment of cotton, possibly Egyptian, to Sicily, a producer of this commodity: Abulafia, *ibid.*, p. 219.

yet since their silk industry remained fairly modest, it was to be expected that they would continue to offer raw silk for sale. The overall economic policy of the Norman rulers favoring the export of raw materials could only foster the shipping of silk to foreign manufacturers.⁽¹²⁵⁾

These general conditions appear to have been duly exploited by Genoese and Lucchese merchants. The Genoese pursued a vigorous commercial activity in Sicily in the second half of the twelfth century. Since the 1180s they were joined there by Lucchese traders, who either acted in conjunction with them or conducted business on their own. Raw cotton and raw silk were among the island's commodities these merchants wished to purchase. Their acquisitions in the island were partly financed by proceeds from the sale of imported woolen, cotton and linen textiles of varying provenance, or even that of silk fabrics manufactured in Lucca itself.⁽¹²⁶⁾ We have already noted the apparent export of Lucca's silks to Sicily in 1201 and 1205.⁽¹²⁷⁾ It may be safely assumed that with the expansion of the Lucchese silk industry the export of raw silk from Southern Italy was increasingly deflected from its previous course, toward Byzantine silk centers, in favor of Lucca. To be sure, silk from Cosenza and Calabria is not attested in Lucca before 1248 and 1295, respectively.⁽¹²⁸⁾ It is difficult to believe, however, that the Genoese and Lucchese silk merchants should have failed to take advantage of the resources of these areas at an earlier date. The absence of evidence in this respect may be ascribed to two factors: first, the unstable political conditions existing in the Kingdom of Sicily since the

death of William II in 1189 until Frederick II assumed effective power in his realm in 1220, a situation that undoubtedly reduced the volume of Genoese and Lucchese trade, including the purchase of raw silk in the realm; and, more generally, the fragmentary nature of the sources and of the information these provide, already stressed above. It is not clear whether we face the same problem of documentation with respect to the Levant. The Venetians are known to have imported silk from this region in the twelfth century,⁽¹²⁹⁾ yet no similar evidence regarding the Genoese has survived, despite the latter's intense commercial activity in the Eastern Mediterranean. It is a matter of speculation, therefore, whether they abstained at that stage from importing raw silk from this region.

While the Lucchese manufacturers surely preferred silk produced in areas fairly close to Genoa, the transportation of which was cheaper, they had apparently no choice but to acquire silk from additional sources. It would seem, though, that general economic considerations carried more weight in this respect. Since the late twelfth century western textile manufacturers sought not only to meet a growing demand, but also to cater to the varying taste and economic capability of an ever wider clientele.⁽¹³⁰⁾ These developments, which affected also the producers of silks, required a diversification in raw materials, among them of superior quality, a more systematic and continuous purchase policy, and an intensification of imports. As a result, there was a progressive extension of the geographical area from which these imports took place. In March 1191 we witness for the fir-

(125) These issues are discussed above.

(126) Abulafia, *The Two Italies*, pp. 255-261, and see also pp. 218-219. In England and Flanders the Lucchese merchants operated along similar lines, selling their own silk fabrics and purchasing local wool.

(127) See above, n. 110.

(128) Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia*, I, pp. 49-50; Bonghi, *Della mercatura dei Lucchesi*, p. 34, n. 1. Incidentally, a royal monopoly on the acquisition of raw silk from producers and its sale to customers was enforced in the Kingdom of Sicily since 1231: E. Winkelmann, *Acta imperii inedita saeculi XIII*, Innsbruck, 1880, I, p. 614, no. 785.

(129) See above, n. 60.

(130) See Mazzaoui, *The Italian Cotton Industry* pp. 87-89, 96-100, who focuses on cotton.

st time the arrival in Genoa of raw silk from a region located beyond the lands bordering the Eastern Mediterranean. A load of 168 pounds of *sela marchexana*, in all likelihood apparently originating in Marv Shāhidjān, Khorāsān, was sold by a Lucchese to two partners, one of whom also was a Lucchese.⁽¹³¹⁾ The import of silk from a region as distant as Khorāsān seems to imply that the basic supply of Lucca coming from Southern Italy, Sicily and the Levant was neither sufficient, nor satisfactory in grade. The political evolution in the Kingdom of Sicily in this period, mentioned above, may have been partly responsible for this situation.

We have no information about the itinerary followed by the Khorāsān silk on its way to Genoa. This is not the place to reconsider whether or not the Genoese were allowed to sail into the Black Sea before 1204.⁽¹³²⁾ However, it is noteworthy that, except for a small number of them visiting Constantinople, they were practically excluded from the Byzantine Empire between 1182 and 1192, thus precisely in the period in which the silk from Khorāsān arrived at Genoa.⁽¹³³⁾ Yet there were more compelling reasons, of an economic nature, for this silk to avoid Constantinople. After leaving Khorāsān it must have proceeded to Tabriz and Sivas, the Seldjuk capital in Asia Minor, then via Kayseri and Konya to the Mediterranean coast, which it most likely reached at Antālya. The importance

of this overland route across Asia Minor since the late twelfth century is illustrated in various ways. Several caravanserais were constructed between Kayseri and Konya, presumably in the reign of Qilidj Arslan II (1155-1192), and a new market in this city is documented in 1201-1202. Two imposing khans were added by the Seldjuks between Sivas and Kayseri, one between 1232 and 1236 and the other between 1230 and 1240. Growing commercial traffic from Trebizond, Lesser Armenia and Persia intersected at Sivas, which according to the Arab historian Ibn al-Athir was a thriving market by 1205-1206. A large hospital was built in the city in 1217-1218. Antālya, an important port of call between Alexandria and Constantinople on the southern coast of Asia Minor, was then the Mediterranean outlet of the routes crossing Asia Minor.⁽¹³⁴⁾ *

Antālya, called Satalia in western sources, was visited by Genoese merchants since 1156 and presumably even earlier.⁽¹³⁵⁾ Apparently some of them settled there, whether permanently or for a number of years, as we may gather from the surname of Raimondo de Satalia, attested in Genoa in 1191 and 1192, thus precisely in the period in which the Khorāsān silk arrived in Genoa.⁽¹³⁶⁾ In 1207 the Seldjuks conquered Antālya and thereby consolidated its role in land trade.⁽¹³⁷⁾ The ongoing activity and presence of Genoese merchants in the city, confirmed by a charter of 1212 and the appearance of Nicola *

(131) M.W. Hall, H.C. Krueger, R.L. Reynolds (eds.), *Notai liguri del sec. XII, II. Guglielmo Cassinese (1190-1192)*, Torino, 1938, I, pp. 104-105, no. 256. In all likelihood this silk is the one recorded in 1288 under the names *merdacesi* and *mercadanzia* at Lucca and Genoa: see, respectively, Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, p. 291, n. 1, and Racine, *Le marché génois de la soie*, pp. 406, 407, 417; see also below, n. 168. In the fourteenth century it appears as *merdacascia* and *mordecascio*: Pegolotti, pp. 208, 298, 300. On its origin, see Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, p. 673. Marv Shāhidjān was not in Sogdiana, as stated by several authors. On the silk of Khorāsān, see Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles*, pp. 87, 89-92. *

(132) S. Origone, *Bisanzio e Genova*, Genova, 1992, p. 75, n. 41, sums up the discussion but refrains from taking a stand.

(133) D. Jacoby, *Conrad, Marquis of Montferrat, and the Kingdom of Jerusalem (1187-1192)*, in G. Pitarino (ed.), *Atti del Congresso Internazionale "Dai feudi monferrini e dal Piemonte ai nuovi mondi oltre gli Oceani"*, Alessandria, 1993, pp. 222-223. A Genoese ship presumably on her way to Satalia was robbed nearby shortly before 1174: CDG II, p. 216, note. *

(134) See Cl. Cahen, *Le commerce anatolien au début du XIII^e siècle*, in *Mélanges Louis Halphen*, pp. 92-101, esp. 92-93, 96, repr. in Id., *Turcobyzantina et Oriens Christianus*, London, 1974, no. XII; also Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, pp. 280-282.

(135) Giovanni Scriba (as above, n. 50), I, nos. 126-127.

(136) *Guglielmo Cassinese* (as above, n. 131), I, no. 713, and II, no. 1795).

(137) See Cahen, *Le commerce anatolien*, p. 93.

de Satalia in Genoa in 1216, may have been partly linked to the silk trade.⁽¹³⁸⁾ Pisans and Venetians were also active at Antālya, the latter apparently continuously visiting the city in the first half of the thirteenth century. Silk is not recorded among the tax-exempted commodities in the treaty of 1220 between Venice and the Seldjuks.⁽¹³⁹⁾ Yet we may assume that the Venetians handled this commodity, like the Provençal merchants who by 1236 were regularly shipping silk from Seldjuk territory to the West via Cyprus, most likely from Antālya.⁽¹⁴⁰⁾ It is impossible to determine whether Khorāsān silk continued to be imported after its first appearance in Genoa in 1191 up to 1288, when it is again documented in Italy. In any event, it is surely along the same land route across Asia Minor that additional varieties of high-grade silk from inner Asia travelled to Lucca since 1230, namely *seta gangia*, *leggia* and *giorgiana*, silk from the areas of Gandja, Lāhidjān and

* Djurdjān, respectively to the southwest, south and south-east of the Caspian Sea. The last variety is also documented in a Lucchese chartulary of 1246.⁽¹⁴¹⁾

The western search for new sources and hi-

gher grades of raw materials for the Lucchese silk industry was significantly furthered by the political developments of the early thirteenth century. The opening of former Byzantine territories to western penetration in the wake of the Fourth Crusade, noted above, intensified the search for raw silk, cocoons and kermes. The lifting of restrictions on the export of these raw materials from Romania was of particular benefit for the development of the western silk industries.⁽¹⁴²⁾ There is fairly abundant information in this respect for the thirteenth century. Genoese merchants are attested in Latin Thessalonica in 1206 and at various occasions in Constantinople yet, considering the nature of the relations between Venice and Genoa from 1204 to 1261, their activity in the Latin Empire could only have been intermittent. It was presumably more consistent in other areas of Romania, such as Negroponte or Euboea, as well as in the Byzantine empire of Nicaea.⁽¹⁴³⁾ There is evidence to suggest that Lucchese merchants were buying silk in this territory since the 1240s, if not earlier.⁽¹⁴⁴⁾ Unfortunately, many documents referring to silk from Romania offer no indication about its precise origin. Such is the case,

(138) *Lanfranco* (as above, n. 112), nos. 717, 754: II, nos. 1303-1304. For 1212, see M. Balard, *Les Gênois en Romanie entre 1204 et 1261. Recherches sur les minutiers notariaux génois*, in "Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire, publiés par l'Ecole Française de Rome", 78 (1966), p. 475.

(139) On western presence at Antālya, see Cahen, *Le commerce anatolien*, pp. 96-99, and Venice's maritime statutes of 1233 and 1255: Predelli e Sacerdoti, *Gli statuti marittimi veneziani*, pp. 60-61, para. 27, and pp. 134-135, para. 70. The treaty of 1220: TTh, II, pp. 221-225, esp. 222; see also M.E. Martin, *The Venetian-Seldjuk Treaty of 1220*, in "English Historical Review", (1980), pp. 321-330, esp. 325-326.

(140) See above, n. 75.

(141) See Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia*, I, pp. 45-46, for *gange* and *giorgiana*, and in 1246 *testitorii giorgiani facti*, or silk ready for weaving; Lopez, *The Unexplored Wealth*, p. 422, where 'Georgian' should be replaced by 'Djurdjan'; M. Balard, *La Romanie génoise (XII^e - début du XV^e siècle)* (Bibliothèque des Ecoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 235), Rome, 1978, II, pp. 725-726 and n. 40, 730, for *leggia* in 1238, 1244, 1253, yet the suggested itinerary via Lesser Armenia is unlikely for this period: see below. Identification of the last of these silk types by Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, p. 291, who, however, writes 'Gorgan'. On this high-grade *ibrisim* silk, see Serjeant, *Islamic Textiles*, pp. 69-70, 71, 80-81.

(142) For instance, in December 1210 two individuals, one of whom a Lucchese, bought in Genoa 6 centenaria and 53 pounds *grane de Romania*: *Lanfranco* (as above, n. 112), I, no. 915.

(143) Evidence and background in Balard, *Les Gênois en Romanie entre 1204 et 1261*, pp. 467-502, whose assumption about a Genoese colony in Constantinople in this period, *ibid.*, p. 479, is unwarranted; see the careful assessment in this respect by S. Origone, *Die Verträge der ersten Hälfte des 13. Jahrhunderts zwischen Genua und Venedig*, "Mitteilungen des Bulgarischen Forschungsinstitutes in Österreich", 8 (1986), p. 92.

(144) The silk cloth bought in Nicaea, mentioned about 1180, implies sericulture in northwestern Asia Minor, anyhow documented by other sources: see above, nn. 54 and 109, for my forthcoming study.

for instance, with a Genoese charter of 1262 dealing with the price of this silk.⁽¹⁴⁵⁾

The information concerning the Peloponnese is more abundant and precise. The Venetian ports of Modone and Corone in the south of the peninsula, as well as Chiarenza and Patras in the Frankish principality of Morea served as the main outlets for the shipment of silk, silk cocoons, dyes and silk textiles produced in the region.⁽¹⁴⁶⁾ These commodities followed two major itineraries, one to Venice and the other to Southern Italy, from where a large portion of them was conveyed further north, Lucca clearly being one of their main destinations.⁽¹⁴⁷⁾ Indeed, Lucchese documents of the second half of the thirteenth century mention the import of *seta de Patrasso* and *seta chiarentana*, silk from Patras and Chiarenza, respectively.⁽¹⁴⁸⁾ Several Genoese charters drafted since 1274 record *commenda* contracts and the export of western woolen fabrics to Chiarenza.⁽¹⁴⁹⁾ The operation of the Genoese merchants in this city apparently followed the pattern already encountered in Sicily in the twelfth century, the import of finished textiles financing, partly at least, the purchase of raw silk for the supply of Lucca and some minor silk centers of Northern Italy. Genoese activity in Chiarenza must have begun many years before the 1270s, when it is first documented. This is already implied by the Genoese presence in Thebes before 1240, examined above. Moreover, the decisive importance of Lucca as the

main importer of Peloponnesian silk is revealed by a Pisan commercial manual, composed in 1278, which states that *in della Morea si pesa libra lucchese*. While there is no explicit reference to silk at that point, the following three items in the manual deal specifically with this commodity. The connection of the Lucchese weight with silk is thus obvious, as there was no other reason for its adoption in the Peloponnese.⁽¹⁵⁰⁾ The so-called *Zibaldone da Canal*, a Venetian commercial manual completed in the 1320s at the latest, reports that a different silk pound was used at Corone, clearly because this port was under Venetian rule and exported silk mainly to Venice.⁽¹⁵¹⁾ It follows that the Lucchese weight system was customary for silk in the Frankish Peloponnese. Despite the absence of direct evidence, then, we may safely conclude that after 1204 the bulk of the silk exports from this area went to Lucca via Southern Italy. At any rate, this was certainly the case in the first half of the thirteenth century, before the expanding silk industry of Venice began to absorb a growing proportion of silk, cocoons and dyes produced in Greece. Western silk manufacturers continued to import Levantine silk in the thirteenth century. Cargoes dispatched from Tyre and Beirut are attested in 1202 and 1222, respectively,⁽¹⁵²⁾ yet it is mainly at Acre that Levantine silk appears to have been concentrated for shipping to the West. This is hinted by the Venetian maritime statutes of 1233 and 1255. By

(145) A.S.G., Cartolari notarili [hereafter: Cart.], no. 71, fol. 126v-127r.

(146) On the role of these ports at a later period, see Jacoby, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, quoted above, n. 121.

(147) The supply network of the Venetian silk industry requires a separate treatment.

(148) Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia*, I, pp. 49, 51, with correct identifications by Bonghi, *Della mercatura dei Lucchesi*, pp. 36-37.

(149) See Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, I, pp. 163-164 and n. 211; charters of 1287 explicitly mention woolens.

(150) R. Lopez - G. Airal di (ed.), *Il più antico manuale italiano di pratica della mercatura*, in *Miscellanea di studi storici*, II (Colana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da G. Pistarino, 38), Genova, 1983, p. 127, fol. 360, ll. 15-23. In the fourteenth century the Lucchese silk pound was also utilized in Florence and Pisa: Pegolotti, pp. 197, 204.

(151) A. Stussi (ed.), *Zibaldone da Canal, manoscritto mercantile del sec. XIV* (Fonti per la storia di Venezia, Sez. V - Fondi vari), Venezia, 1967, p. 58, fol. 35v. l. 19; for the dating of this work, see D. Jacoby, *A Venetian Manual of Commercial Practice from Crusader Acre*, in Airal di e Kedar, *I comuni italiani*, pp. 404-405, 410, repr. in Jacoby, *Studies*, no. VII. On the export of silk to Venice, see Jacoby, *Silk Production in the Frankish Peloponnese*, n. 20.

(152) A.S.G., Mss., no. 102, fol. 238v., for Tyre, from which it was exported, yet one should remember that there was no sericulture around this city: see above, n. 61; for Beirut. see above, n. 72.

this time silk yarn from Antioch was regularly arriving at Acre.⁽¹⁵³⁾ A ship sailing from this port to Marseilles in 1248 had on board 20 1/2 pounds *de serico torto de ultramare tincto diversis coloribus*, or dyed twisted silk ready for weaving.⁽¹⁵⁴⁾ Significantly, Ogerio Riccio had taken advantage of his post as Genoese consul in Acre before July 1249 to get acquainted with the Levantine market. The following year, after returning to Genoa, he was importing various commodities from the Levant, including silk.⁽¹⁵⁵⁾

The evidence bearing on the provisioning of silk to Lucca via Genoa in the first half of the thirteenth century, largely culled from the notarial records of the two cities, is rather fragmentary and does not provide a clear picture of the evolving trade pattern.⁽¹⁵⁶⁾ The sources nevertheless reveal some general trends. There appears to have been continuity in the imports from Calabria,⁽¹⁵⁷⁾ as well as from the Levant.⁽¹⁵⁸⁾ Yet political circumstances in the Eastern Mediterranean created favorable conditions for a substantial extension of the geographical network of western silk provisioning. This process began in the late twelfth century with the establishment of Seljuk rule in Asia Minor, which enhanced the intensification of land trade in this region. The Fourth Crusade generated some structural changes in the silk economy of Romania. It not

only facilitated western access to the silk products of the region, but also resulted in an important shift in the nature of silk exports to the West, which previously were restricted to finished products and after 1204 combined textiles with raw materials. There is good reason to believe that the growing western demand for raw silk in the thirteenth century stimulated the expansion of sericulture in Southern Italy, the regions of Romania under Latin rule, the Byzantine empire of Nicaea, Turkish Asia Minor and the Levant.⁽¹⁵⁹⁾ While this process was beneficial for western silk manufacturers, increasing western purchases deprived the local silk industries of these regions from a growing share of their raw materials.

The establishment of Mongol rule over large areas of Asia greatly promoted trade, including in silk, along the east-west land route crossing this continent. The western section of this route, however, was diverted from its previous course through Asia Minor toward Antälyä. As a result of favorable political relations between Lesser Armenia and the Mongols since the 1250s, this route now converged on Laiazzo, in Lesser Armenia, which became its main Mediterranean outlet.⁽¹⁶⁰⁾ Indeed, the silk from Gandja and Djurdjan reaching Genoa since 1258 travelled via Laiazzo.⁽¹⁶¹⁾ In addition, Chi-

(153) See above, n. 62.

(154) L. Blancard (ed.), *Documents inédits sur le commerce de Marseille au moyen âge*, Marseille, 1884-1885, no. 987.

(155) A.S.G., Cart., no. 27, fol. 42r, and 117v, about an *accomendatio* in silk to Genoa in 1250. There has been much confusion about Ogerio Riccio's term of office as consul at Acre. By July 1249 he had been replaced by Guglielmo de Bulgaro, while his partner as co-consul Simone Malloccello continued to serve. All the references to Ogerio Riccio point to the past: C. Desimoni (ed.), *Quatre titres des propriétés des Gênois à Acre et à Tyr*, "Archives de l'Orient latin", 2/2, (1884), pp. 215-218, 222.

(156) This is even the case with the richer evidence provided for 1288 by Racine, *Le marché génois de la soie*, pp. 403-417, which is based on a single notary.

(157) Despite the absence of documents up to the 1240s: see above, n. 128.

(158) See above, pp. 59-60. The silk from this region appears later as *sela sorianu*: Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia*, I, p. 50.

(159) A similar development occurred with respect to cotton in the same period. One should remember that the eleventh century extension of sericulture in Calabria also came in response to a growing demand of manufacturers.

(160) On Laiazzo's role, see Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, II, pp. 73-92; Jacoby, *A Venetian Manual*, pp. 412-413, 416-417; Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, pp. 290-291, who also deals with the political background.

(161) See Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, II, p. 727, n. 46, a reference to *cunzia* in 1258; R.S. Lopez, *Nuove luci sugli Italiani in Estremo Oriente prima di Colombo*, repr. in Id., *Su e giù per la storia di Genova* (Collana storica di fonti e studi, diretta da Geo Pistarino, 20), Genova, 1975, p. 129, no. 2, in 1259, and *ibid.*, p. 101 and n. 33, where instead of 'Georgia' read 'Djurdjan'; see also above, n. 141.

nese silk (*seta catuia*) arrived in this city since 1256, if not somewhat earlier, from where it was conveyed to Genoa.⁽¹⁶²⁾ Much attention has been devoted to this silk, yet one should not forget that Central Asian silk preceded it in Genoa by several decades. Finally high-grade silk from Mamistra in Lesser Armenia was also shipped westwards in 1259.⁽¹⁶³⁾ Significantly, in Laiazzo silk appears to have been mainly handled by Genoese merchants. While some amounts may have found their way to the fairs of Champagne, the bulk of it was certainly conveyed to Lucca, as implied by Lucchese purchases documented in Genoa since 1259, and to some minor Italian centers of silk manufacture.⁽¹⁶⁴⁾

It is impossible to determine the itinerary followed by the *seta iurea* originating in Georgia, recorded in Lucca in 1256.⁽¹⁶⁵⁾ Since the Genoese were then absent from Constantinople and the Black Sea,⁽¹⁶⁶⁾ it may have travelled from the Caucasus to Trebizond and from there to Laiazzo, or else via Tabriz to this port, before proceeding to Genoa and Lucca. Alternatively, it may have been handled by intermediaries, such as

the Lombards, Pisans, Provençaux and Anconitans active at that time in Latin Constantinople * in 1261 resulted in the opening of the Black Sea to Genoese merchants and, more generally, in a substantial expansion of western trade in the region in the following decades. Within this framework an increasing flow of silk from the Caucasus began to arrive at Black Sea ports,⁽¹⁶⁷⁾ from where it was conveyed via Constantinople to Genoa. Moreover, some Khorāsān silk, which previously had travelled by way of Laiazzo only, also reached the Black Sea and was shipped from the Crimea along the same maritime lane.⁽¹⁶⁸⁾ The opening and consolidation of this route was the last major stage in the establishment of the complex network of silk supply linking the Eastern Mediterranean to the West in the thirteenth century. The detailed reconstruction of this network and of the chronology of its development is essential for an understanding of the growth of western silk manufacture in this period. This reconstruction, however, still awaits a thorough investigation of notarial records.

(162) Lopez, *Nuove luci sugli Italiani*, pp. 100-101, and Doehard, *Les relations commerciales*, II, no. 986, a deal in Chinese silk concluded in Genoa on 16 January 1257. Since long-distance shipping came to a standstill in the winter, the silk must have arrived in 1256.

(163) Lopez, *Nuove luci sugli Italiani*, p. 101, n. 59. A Florentine commercial manual of the 1320s refers to the *molto finissima seta* of Lesser Armenia, *quasi della migliore che sia in ogni parte*. Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, p. 318.

(164) On this issue I suggest a middle course between the interpretations of Lopez, *Nuove luci sugli Italiani*, pp. 100-101, 129-130, nos. 2-3, and Bautier, *Les relations économiques des Occidentaux*, pp. 290-291.

(165) Bini, *I Lucchesi a Venezia*, I, p. 50, reads *diuria*. For its identification, see Racine, *Le marché génois de la soie*, p. 405, and for 1288, *ibid.*, pp. 415, 417; see also Balard, *La Romanie génoise*, II, p. 726, n. 45, for evidence since 1264.

(166) On the reduced presence of the Genoese in the Latin Empire, see above, n. 138. Since 1256 the armed conflict * between Genoa and Venice in the Levant and at sea excluded all Genoese activity in Constantinople, controlled by Venice, or the Black Sea.

(167) On the activity of these Latins, see M.E. Martin, *The First Venetians in the Black Sea*, in O. Lampsidis (ed.), in *The Byzantine Black Sea* = *Archeion Pontou*, 35 (1979), pp. 117-119.

(168) G.I. Brătianu (ed.), *Actes des notaires génois de Péra et de Caffa de la fin du treizième siècle (1281-1289)*, Bucarest, 1927, nos. 200, 209, 211, 213, and p. 337, no. 163, all of 1289.

The Jews and the Silk Industry of Constantinople

Some time after the middle of the twelfth century the Jew Benjamin son of Jonah left his residence at Tudela, a city of Navarra in Spain, for a long journey that lasted several years. In the course of his travels he visited shortly after 1160 some twenty-five Jewish communities in the Byzantine empire, about which he has left us precious information. In three of these communities, namely those of Thebes, Thessalonica and Constantinople, he found Jews employed in the silk industry.¹ Silk textiles played an important symbolic role in the ceremonial of the imperial court and the Church, as well as in the Empire's political relations with foreign rulers and powers. In addition, they served as a status symbol in Byzantine society and in terms of value constituted the most important export commodity of Byzantium.²

Benjamin of Tudela's references to the Jewish silk workers are very brief. They are nevertheless of considerable importance because, strangely, after the sixth century there is not a single Byzantine source directly attesting that Jews took part in the Empire's production of silk textiles. This is all the more surprising with respect to Constantinople, the major Byzantine center of silk manufacture in the four centuries following the loss of the eastern provinces to the Muslims. The apparent silence of the Byzantine sources in this respect has given rise to various explanations, which will be examined below in due course. Yet at this point it is already important to note that Benjamin of

¹ M.N. Adler (ed.), *The Itinerary of Benjamin of Tudela*, London, 1907 [hereafter: BT], Hebrew text, pp. 12–16; for my own English translation of the relevant passages, see below. I shall deal elsewhere with the dating of Benjamin's journey through the Empire.

² See R.S. Lopez, 'Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', *Speculum*, 20 (1945), p. 25–41, repr. in *idem*, *Byzantium and the World Around It: Economic and Institutional Relations*, London, 1978, no. III. The sources translated by M. Hamidullah, 'Nouveaux documents sur les rapports de l'Europe avec l'Orient du moyen âge', *Arabica*, 7 (1960), pp. 281–291, 293–297, deal in fact with Byzantine silk fabrics sent to Muslim rulers. Several studies on silk in the relations between Byzantium and the West by A. Muthesius have been reproduced with some modifications in her *Studies in Byzantine and Islamic Silk Weaving*, London, 1995, and the subject is also treated in *eadem*, *Byzantine Silk Weaving AD 400 to AD 1200*, edited by E. Kislinger and J. Koder, Vienna, 1997; however, see my review of this study in *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 92 (1999), pp. 536–538. D. Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium before the Fourth Crusade', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 84/85 (1991–1992), pp. 452–500, offers a different approach with an emphasis on silk economics.

Tudela's account is not the only testimony about the activity of Jewish silk workers in Constantinople. Some Byzantine, western and Jewish sources – most of the latter still unpublished documents from the Cairo Genizah or synagogue archive – shed more light on these workers, whether directly or indirectly, and enable a better knowledge of their activities.

With the meagre information at our disposal we have to address three major issues:

1. Since when were Jews employed in the silk industry of Constantinople?
2. What were their precise occupations in the framework of this industry?
3. What happened after the 1160s to the Jewish silk workers of the capital, about whom we hear no more?

Byzantine sources from the fourth to the sixth century seem to imply that Jews were involved in the manufacture of silk fabrics, though it is not clear in what capacity, and that they excelled in the production of purple and red dyes. These sources have been adduced to suggest that Jews continuously participated in the activity of the Empire's silk industry.³ However, a documentary gap of several centuries after these testimonies precludes any sweeping generalizations in this respect. Moreover, the information adduced is not relevant for Constantinople and, therefore, does not contribute to the clarification of the issues examined here.

There is nevertheless some early evidence pointing to the connection of Jews with silk fabrics apparently manufactured in the Empire's capital. A hagiographic work composed about 640, the *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*, mentions the activity of the Jew Jacob, who served as the agent of a Greek merchant. In 632 Jacob sailed on behalf of his employer from Constantinople to the province Africa in order to sell several garments, the total value of which was 144 nomismata. The whole operation was conducted in secrecy, in order to avoid official control of the merchandise. The nature of the fabric from which the garments were made is not stated, yet their high cost, the peculiar itinerary followed by Jacob, as well as the circumstances of his transactions imply that these were silk vestments, the export of which from

³ See E. Kislinger, 'Jüdische Gewerbetreibende in Byzanz', in A. Ebenbauer / Kl. Zatloukal, *Die Juden in ihrer mittelalterlichen Umwelt*, Wien-Köln-Weimar, 1991, p. 106; A. Muthesius, 'The Hidden Jewish Element in Byzantium's Silk Industry: A Catalyst for the Impact of Byzantine Silks on the Latin Church before 1200 A. D.?', *Bulletin of Judaean-Greek Studies*, 10 (Summer 1992), pp. 22–23, 24–25, repr. in *eadem*, *Studies in Byzantine and Islamic Silk Weaving*, no. XV; see my negative assessment of this study in Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 482, n. 169, and p. 487, n. 199.

Constantinople was either prohibited or heavily taxed. The Jew Jacob was thus involved in the illicit export and sale of silken garments, yet not in their manufacture.⁴

Further information about Jews connected with silk is to be found in the extant version of the 'Book of the Eparch' (Ἐπαρχικὸν Βιβλίον), a collection of provisions regulating the activity of a number of professional guilds in the Empire's capital.⁵ Whatever the nature and date of this version and the circumstances in which it was compiled, the original text clearly belongs to the early tenth century and reproduces provisions sanctioned and enforced by the imperial government.⁶ One of these provisions prohibited the *metaxopratai* or silk merchants from selling *metaxa*, i.e. silk or cocoons, either to Jews or to merchants in order to prevent the export of these commodities from the city (Ἐβραίοις ἢ ἑμποροῖς πρὸς τὸ διαπιπράσκειν αὐτὴν τῆς πόλεως).⁷ It has recently been argued that these Jews and merchants – whose identity is not specified, yet obviously were not Jewish – came to Constantinople from the provinces. The provision just mentioned seems thus to conform with the diffident and restrictive imperial policy toward provincial subjects, illustrated by the 'Book of the Eparch' and other sources.⁸ It should be stressed, how-

⁴ *Doctrina Jacobi nuper baptizati*, ed. and trans. V. Déroche in *Travaux et Mémoires*, 11 (1991), pp. 72, 127–129, 215–219 (I, 3 and 40–41; V, 20); commentary by G. Dagron, 'Juifs et Chrétiens dans l'Orient du VIIe siècle', *ibid.*, pp. 234–246, and for the dating of the work, pp. 246–247. For the dating of Jacob's journey, see also D. Jacoby, 'The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland', in C. Mango and G. Dagron (eds.), *Constantinople and its Hinterland* (Papers from the Twenty-Seventh Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, Oxford, April 1993), Aldershot, 1995, p. 222.

⁵ J. Koder (ed. and trans.), *Das Eparchenbuch des Leons des Weisen. Einführung, Edition, Übersetzung und Indices* (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XXXIII), Wien, 1991 (hereafter: EB).

⁶ Recent discussion by J. Koder, 'Überlegungen zu Aufbau und Entstehung des Eparchikon Biblion', in J. Chrysostomides (ed.), *ΚΑΘΗΓΗΤΡΙΑ. Essays presented to Joan Hussey for her 80th Birthday*, Camberley, Surrey, 1988, pp. 85–97, and J. Koder, EB, pp. 20–41; P. Speck, '(Erlassenes?) Gesetz oder ein weiteres Schulbuch? Überlegungen zur Entstehung des Eparchenbuchs', in *idem* (ed.), *Varia III* (Ποικίλα Βυζαντινά, 11), Bonn, 1991, pp. 293–306, has raised various objections to Koder's conclusions. I shall return to these issues in my forthcoming book on Byzantine silk.

⁷ EB 6.16. Other closely related provisions forbade the secret sale of *metaxa* by the *metaxopratai* or the *katartarioi* (on whom see below), respectively, to individuals unauthorized to buy it: EB 6.13, 7.5. D. Simon, 'Die byzantinischen Seidenzünfte', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 68 (1975), pp. 25–26, 30, 39, stresses that *metaxa* also stands for cocoons, yet raises unfounded doubts about their trade in the Empire; on this trade, see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 484 and n. 183.

⁸ On this policy, see N. Oikonomidès, 'Le marchand byzantin des provinces (IXe-XIe s.)', in *Mercati e mercanti nell'alto medioevo: l'area euroasiatica e l'area mediterranea* (Settimane di

ever, that the residents of the provinces appear in other regulations of the 'Book of the Eparch' as ἔξωτικοί or as being ἔξωθεν, literally 'outsiders' or '[coming] from the outside', i.e. aliens, who reach Constantinople either to sell their merchandise or to buy there goods.⁹ These terms or expressions are applied neither to the Jews, nor to the merchants mentioned in our regulation, and we may thus safely assume that the individuals to whom it refers were inhabitants of Constantinople.

The purpose of the ban, then, was to prevent these individuals from selling silk as raw material to other merchants coming to the city either from the provinces or from foreign countries.¹⁰ In other words, the Jews and non-Jewish merchants we are dealing with, who were familiar with the local supply network and market conditions, acted as middlemen in business ventures leading to the illicit export of silk from the city and, most likely, also from the Empire. This export ran counter the principles of the silk marketing system which the authorities sought to enforce in Constantinople. According to these principles, reflected by the 'Book of the Eparch', the city was to import raw materials, namely silk and cocoons, dyes and mordants, as well as finished products, yet should have exported exclusively the latter.¹¹ This explains the ban on the export of silk in the chapter devoted to the guild of the silk merchants.

The specific reference to Jews in this context implies that the latter had acquired a share in the illicit export of silk sufficient to warrant the attention

studio del Centro italiano sull'alto medioevo, 40), Spoleto, 1993, pp. 655–656; D. Jacoby, 'The Byzantine Outsider in Trade (c.900–c.1350)', in D. C. Smythe (ed.), *Strangers to Themselves: The Byzantine Outsider* (Papers from the Thirty-Second Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies, University of Sussex, Brighton, March 1998), Aldershot, 2000, pp. 132–134.

⁹ ἔξωτικοί: EB 6.9, 8.3, 8.7, 8.8; ἔξωθεν: EB 4.1, 6.5, 7.1, 7.2. In 5.5, however, this last expression is used for the Syrian importers whose sojourn in Constantinople was limited to three months, and in 20.2 for foreigners in general, although the latter were usually called ἑθνικοί, as in 8.5 and 8.7.

¹⁰ This interpretation is enhanced by a comparison with other regulations prohibiting the sale of slaves trained in a branch of silk manufacture to the members of these two groups, ἔξωτικοί and ἑθνικοί, which are explicitly mentioned: EB 8.7. See also EB 4.1, prohibiting the sale of specific silk wares termed *kekolymena* (κεκωλυμένα) to residents of the provinces, in order to prevent their export from the Empire.

¹¹ Import of silk and cocoons: EB 6.5; see also 7.1 and 7.2. The *metaxopratai* were not allowed to travel outside the city to buy them: EB 6.12. Note that the Syrians imported silk fabrics and clothing, yet no silk or cocoons; in addition, they brought spices, perfumes and dyeing materials which they sold to the μυρεψοί or perfumers: EB 5.1, 2, 4, and 10.1. The use of mordants, essential for the fixing of colours, has been overlooked for the period examined here, yet see now Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 483–484. On the export of silk fabrics and garments from Constantinople: EB 4.1, 4.4, 4.8, 5.5, 8.5.

of the imperial authorities. They acted individually or may have established a trade network of their own, fostered by ethnic solidarity and facilitated by the common use of Hebrew, which connected them with Jewish merchants visiting Constantinople. There is good reason to believe that the Jews of the city selling silk maintained particularly close links with the Jewish merchants known as *al-Radhaniyya*, or Radhanites, whose activity and itineraries in the ninth and early tenth century are documented by two contemporary Persian authors. These merchants, some of whom knew Greek, traveled between the West and the Far East. A number of those returning from China by way of Egypt reached Constantinople, where they sold their merchandise. There is no information about the commodities they bought in the city for export to the West, yet we may postulate that these included silk textiles. In addition, from the 'Book of the Eparch' we may gather that they illegally purchased raw silk for export either with the help of local middlemen, among them Jewish co-religionists, or directly from the *metaxopratai*.¹² Various provisions of the 'Book of the Eparch' appear to have already been enforced in the ninth century,¹³ among them possibly the one dealing with Jews engaged in the illicit export of silk. Significantly, though, the 'Book of the Eparch' does not refer to these Jews as merchants, despite their involvement in trade. It follows that they were not professional traders, contrary to the non-Jewish merchants appearing in the same regulation. This conclusion is of major importance in our context, as we shall soon realize.

Later tenth-century sources reveal that Jewish merchants from Southern Italy regularly visited Constantinople and suggest that some of them participated in the silk trade. In 992 the co-emperors Basil II and Constantine VIII responded favorably to Venice, which had complained about the exactions and the arbitrary treatment inflicted by Byzantine officers upon its citizens. The emperors restored the customary passage fee levied at Abydos from Venetian ships sailing through the Straits of the Dardanelles on their way to and from Constantinople. In addition, they promised the orderly conduct of fiscal, administrative and judicial procedures applied to Venetian merchants. On the other hand, Venetian ships returning from Constantinople were limited to the transportation of Venetian traders and their goods. They were prohibited from carrying Amalfitans, Jews and Lombards, i.e. Latins, living in Bari and elsewhere in the province of Langobardia, nor were they allowed to take the merchandise of these individuals on board

¹² See D. Jacoby, 'Les Juifs de Byzance: une communauté marginalisée', in Ch. A. Maltezos (ed.), *Οἱ περιθωριακοὶ στὸ Βυζάντιο* (Ιδρυμα Γουλανδρή – Χόρν), Athens, 1993, pp. 135–137, with references to the sources. On the *metaxopratai*, see also above, p. 3.

¹³ See my forthcoming book mentioned above, n. 6.

their vessels.¹⁴ The prohibition, which for unknown reasons was not to be applied to Greeks,¹⁵ was directed against members of non-Greek groups residing in the Empire's Italian provinces. It concurred with the general attitude of the imperial government toward its provincial subjects, already mentioned above.¹⁶ The existence of Jewish communities in tenth-century Byzantine Italy is well documented.¹⁷

It has not been noted hitherto that the prohibition on transportation mentioned in the chrysobull of 992 concerned exclusively Venetian ships returning from Constantinople to the West, and not vessels sailing in the opposite direction.¹⁸ This distinction is of major importance for a proper understanding of the provision. It was to be expected that the implementation of the procedures mentioned in the charter would reduce Byzantine inspection of the cargo on board Venetian vessels and, therefore, the authorities feared that other imperial subjects would take advantage of this fact. Clearly, the main concern of the emperors in that context was to prevent their Italian subjects from smuggling goods out of the capital under Venetian cover and from defrauding thereby the state treasury.¹⁹ In exchange for imperial favors, then,

¹⁴ Ed. by A. Pertusi, 'Venezia e Bisanzio nel secolo XI', in *La Venezia del Mille (Storia della civiltà veneziana, X)*, Firenze, 1965, pp. 155–160, esp. 157. The passage has been re-edited with corrections by M. Pozza – G. Ravagnani (eds.), *Pacta veneta, IV, I trattati con Bisanzio*, Venezia, 1994, p. 23, yet requires further emendations; see my review of this volume in *Mediterranean Historical Review*, 9 (1994), pp. 140–141. My interpretation of this difficult text differs from that proposed until now. While there appears to have been a return to custom with respect to tolls, the text does not warrant the assumption that the prohibition to take on board non-Venetians had already been enforced previously, except for the Jews, on whom see below; nor is it plausible that the ban on transportation concerned cargo only, as in that period merchants always accompanied shipped goods: *contra* Pertusi, 'Venezia e Bisanzio nel secolo XI', pp. 124–125 and 148, n. 31. V. von Falkenhausen, 'Die Städte im byzantinischen Italien', *Mélanges de l'Ecole française de Rome, Moyen Age*, 101 (1989), pp. 405–406, rightly stresses that the limitation did not apply to the subjects of the Lombard principalities of Benevento, Capua and Salerno, which were not under Byzantine rule.

¹⁵ Their exceptional status in this respect has already been noted by A. Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte der romanischen Völker des Mittelmeergebiets bis zum Ende der Kreuzzüge*, München, 1906, p. 28, yet von Falkenhausen (see previous note) does not mention it. She apparently believes that the text refers to all the residents of the theme of Langobardia.

¹⁶ See above, p. 3.

¹⁷ See J. Starr, *The Jews in the Byzantine Empire, 641–1204* (Texte und Forschungen zur byzantinisch-neugriechische Philologie 30), Athens, 1939, pp. 37–41.

¹⁸ Incidentally, there also was a distinction between the toll paid by ships sailing toward and from Constantinople, respectively: see next note.

¹⁹ The issue was not a possible reduction of state revenue resulting from the transportation of these imperial subjects, since all western ships were apparently bound to pay a sum of 15 *solidi* as passage fee on their return voyage: see above, n. 14.

the Venetians were compelled to agree to the restriction imposed upon them and to forgo the income deriving from transportation services previously offered to Byzantine subjects residing in Southern Italy. It is impossible to determine whether or not this was a new disposition. In any event, from the governmental point of view the ban was all the more imperative because in the past the imperial control over exports had not always been effective, nor had it been strictly enforced. When Liutprand of Cremona first visited Constantinople in 949, the supervision over outbound Venetian and Amalfitan goods, including silk fabrics, appears to have been rather lax. When he returned to the Empire in 968, the Byzantine officers whom he encountered pointed to the implementation of tougher measures to curb illicit exports.²⁰

From the chrysobull of 992 we may gather that Latins other than Venetians or Amalfitans, for instance Gaetans, as well as Jews, were also involved in the export of silk textiles from Constantinople, rather than silk which presumably was already produced by then in Southern Italy.²¹ At first glance the reference of that document to the Jews is somewhat surprising, since a decree issued in 960 by Doge Pietro IV Candiano prohibited Venetian vessels from carrying them. To be sure, this provision was related to the slave trade in the Adriatic, in which Jews participated. It is not excluded, though, that it was also intended for journeys to and from Constantinople, as this city is mentioned in the decree in relation to another issue.²² In any event, the explicit reference to Jews in the chrysobull of 992 implies that the ban issued some thirty years earlier in Venice was not being effectively implemented.

While the 'Book of the Eparch' mentioned Jews trading in silk as raw material, the document of 992 hinted at their participation in the shipment of silk fabrics from Constantinople to Italy. Neither source, however, nor any other one mentions Jews active in the production of silk textiles in the tenth-

²⁰ Liutprand v. Cremona, *Opera. Relatio de legatione constantinopolitana*, cap. 53 and 55, ed. J. Becker (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Scriptores rerum germanicarum in usum scholarum, 41), Hannover und Leipzig, 1915, pp. 204–205.

²¹ On Amalfitan exports of silk fabrics from Constantinople to Southern Italy in this period and somewhat later, see Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, p. 35. Gaetan merchants already traveled to Constantinople by the mid-tenth century: Liutprand v. Cremona, *Opera, Antapodosis*, V. 21, p. 143; see also M. Merore, *Gaeta im frühen Mittelalter (8. bis 12. Jahrhundert). Beiträge zur Geschichte der Stadt*, Gotha, 1911, p. 96; Schaube, *Handelsgeschichte*, pp. 35–36, para. 22. There is evidence on sericulture in Southern Italy since the first half of the eleventh century: see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 463, 475–476.

²² Ed. in Fr. Tafel und G. M. Thomas (eds.), *Urkunden zur älteren Handels- und Staatsgeschichte der Republik Venedig*, Wien, 1856–1857, I, pp. 19–25, esp. 20–21. On the context of this slave trade, see Ch. Verlinden, *L'esclavage dans l'Europe médiévale, II, Italie – Colonies italiennes du Levant – Levant latin – Empire byzantin*, Gent, 1977, pp. 115–117, 131–132.

century Empire.²³ In the absence of evidence in this respect, it has been suggested that Jews did not engage in this period in silk manufacture because of official religious and racial discrimination, illustrated by the attempts of the first Macedonian emperors, Basil I (867–886) and his son Leo VI (886–912), at forcibly converting all the Jews of the Empire to the Christian faith. By contrast, according to this line of argument, the more favorable attitude of the Comnenian dynasty promoted the large-scale employment of Jews in the silk industry since the late eleventh century.²⁴ This assumption may be safely dismissed for several reasons. First, it was in the best interest of the state to promote the Byzantine silk industry; moreover, there is no evidence whatsoever that Jews were ever barred from a specific occupation in the Empire;²⁵ and, finally, some sources that will soon be examined imply that Jews worked in silk manufacture, including in Constantinople, prior to the reign of Alexius I Comnenus which began in 1081.

Before dealing with this period, however, it may prove useful to examine Benjamin of Tudela's references to silk. His testimony in this respect has been largely misunderstood, since most scholars have no direct access to the original Hebrew version of his account and rely on translations, most of which are inaccurate. Benjamin was most explicit about Thebes and mentioned its Jewish silk workers immediately after stating the size of the local Jewish community, in contrast to the description pattern he used with respect to other Jewish communities. This suggests that a large number among the Jews of Thebes were involved in one way or another in the production of silk textiles. The Jewish traveler was impressed by the skills of the local Jewish workers and claimed that they were 'the best craftsmen in the land of the Greeks [= the Empire] at making silk and purple garments'.²⁶ It should be stressed that Benjamin did not refer to the manufacture of silk fabrics, but to that of garments. Consequently, the Jewish craftsmen to whom he was alluding were tailors. The tailoring of silk vestments in Thebes in the twelfth century is confirmed twice by the Byzantine chronicler Niketas Choniates: first, in his references to the Byzantine silk workers deported in 1147 to Sicily by the Normans and, secondly, in his allusion to the annual delivery of Theban silk vestments to the imperial court, attested for 1195.²⁷ Attention

²³ Incidentally, the evidence adduced in the past to prove that Jews were employed in the silk industry of the Peloponnese in that period turns out to be irrelevant: see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 455.

²⁴ See Lopez, 'Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', pp. 23–24. On the persecutions, see Jacoby, 'Les Juifs de Byzance', pp. 124–125.

²⁵ Ibid., pp. 133–134.

²⁶ BT, Hebrew, p. 12.

²⁷ See Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 462–463, 466–467.

should be drawn to Benjamin of Tudela's distinction between purple and other silk garments. Those belonging to the first group were made of purple silk fabrics, some of them being dyed with purple extracted from the murex mollusk. This coloring agent, the most costly and prestigious dye produced at that time, was reserved for imperial garments.²⁸ The handling of the prestigious purple-dyed fabrics intended for the emperor and of other less costly silk textiles commissioned by the imperial court was clearly in the hands of highly qualified artisans.

The Jewish traveler was less explicit in his statements about Jewish silk workers elsewhere in the Empire. When referring to those of Thessalonica he merely recorded that 'they are engaged in the silk craft', and with respect to the Jews of Constantinople, he stated that 'amongst them are silk artisans'.²⁹ Judging by the textual context in which they appear, it would seem that the Jewish silk artisans of these two cities represented a smaller segment of their respective Jewish population than in Thebes.³⁰ Benjamin added two remarks about Constantinople that warrant our attention. He noted the silk vestments worn by the rich men of the city, which displayed 'woven and embroidered' designs. In addition, he reported that 'each year all the revenue from the whole country of Greece [= the Empire] is brought' to the new palace built by Emperor Manuel I, 'and towers are filled with it, with silk and purple garments and gold'.³¹ Benjamin most likely obtained his information from local Jewish silk workers who delivered silk fabrics and garments to the imperial warehouses.³² He did not hint at their specific occupations. However, as the coupling of silk and purple garments also appears in his description of Thebes, we may postulate that at least some of the Jewish artisans of Constantinople were tailors manufacturing high-grade silk garments, like those of the Boeotian city.

We have already noted that in 1147 the Normans abducted silk tailors from Greece to Sicily. Weavers, however, formed the most important group of silk artisans among the deportees. Jews are not specifically mentioned among them, yet their transfer from Thebes to Sicily implies that at least some of them exercised the same crafts as their Greek fellow-captives, namely weaving.³³ This assumption is supported by Jewish sources. Precious information

²⁸ Ibid., pp. 455–458, 481–483, 488, 490.

²⁹ BT, Hebrew, pp. 13 and 16, respectively.

³⁰ See Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 486.

³¹ BT, Hebrew, pp. 15–16. A Milanese author of the 1170s was also impressed by the silk displayed in Constantinople, the city being *in deliciis affluens, pollens in edificiis, in sericis vernans*: L. Savioli (ed.), *Annali bolognesi*, Bassano, 1784, II, p. 56.

³² Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 489–490.

³³ Ibid., pp. 466, 468, 485–486.

about Jewish silk weavers in the Empire is to be found in two Bible commentaries composed in Hebrew by Karaite scholars. The Karaites constituted a Jewish sect advocating the literal exegesis of the Hebrew Bible and rejecting the Rabbinical tradition recorded in the Talmud. Karaite and Rabbanite Jewish communities existed side by side in several Byzantine cities in the eleventh and twelfth century, and this was also the case in Constantinople, as attested by Benjamin himself.³⁴

The earliest among the two Karaite works, which is still unpublished, was composed by Jacob ben Reuben in the second half of the eleventh or in the first half of the twelfth century. It is based on an earlier, eleventh-century work, the dating of which is of particular importance in our context since it preceded by several decades, if not by a whole century, the testimony of Benjamin of Tudela. It is impossible to determine the exact location at which it was composed.³⁵ However, in view of the information collected by its author on silk-related matters and his Greek glosses bearing on this subject, he most likely resided in a major Byzantine silk center. The second commentary was compiled by Yehudah ben Elijah Hadassi in the second half of the twelfth century in Constantinople, and is thus more or less contemporaneous with Benjamin of Tudela's visit in the city.³⁶ Both works examine the biblical prohibition about the wearing of *sha'atnez*, a hybrid cloth combining two kinds of fibers and therefore considered ritually impure.³⁷ The author of the second biblical commentary fully endorsed this prohibition, yet nevertheless stated that 'the making and weaving and buying and selling [of it] in order to earn [a living] is permitted'. To be sure, in this context he did not allude to

³⁴ On the Karaites and their communities in the Empire, see Z. Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium. The Formative Years, 970–1100*, New York – Jerusalem, 1959, in particular pp. 87–168, yet about Constantinople and Thessalonica, see D. Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan Period', *Vizantijskij Vremennik*, 55 (1998), pp. 32–35, and Jacoby, 'The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland', pp. 225–227.

³⁵ Jacob ben Reuben, *Sefer ha-Osher* (MS. Lund, Universitetsbibliotek L. O. 5, dated 1302), commentary on Deuteronomy 22:11; for the date of this unpublished manuscript, see N. Aloni, 'Five Hebrew Manuscripts in the Library of Lund (Sweden)', *Alei Sefer*, 5 (1977), pp. 10–11 [Hebrew]. The sources, nature and dating of this work are discussed by Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, pp. 174–175, 196–198, who used a later copy, MS. Leiden, Warner no. 8.

³⁶ Yehudah ben Elijah Hadassi, *Eshkol hak-Kofer*, ed. published in Gozlow, 1836, fol. 24b, Alphabets 42–43, and fol. 92a, Alphabet 241. On the dating of the second work, see Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, p. 442.

³⁷ On *sha'atnez*, see *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, XIV, Jerusalem, 1971, coll. 1213–1214. The prohibition originally applied to a mixture of wool and linen, yet was later extended to other materials and to uses other than wearing; see also S. B. Bowman, *The Jews of Byzantium, 1204–1453*, University of Alabama, 1985, pp. 119–121.

silk, yet elsewhere in his work he referred to silk worms and to the manufacture of silk fabrics. He was thus keenly aware of the Byzantine context in which he lived and of the practical implications of his discussion of *sha'atnez*. Indeed, this discussion was relevant to silk, since the Byzantine silk industry produced half-silks combining silk with linen or cotton and thus mixing fibers of animal and vegetable origin.³⁸

The first of the two Karaite Bible commentaries just mentioned also offers indirect evidence about Jewish involvement in the dyeing of silk with murex purple. It uses some Greek terms transcribed into Hebrew characters which are connected with this dyestuff. Specifically, it mentions that *porphyra*, the murex mollusk, is a σκουλήκι or worm found in the sea, in order to stress that the color derived from it is an animal dye, and twice reports the pouring of hot water on the shells in order to extract from them the coloring agent.³⁹ The brief description offered by the Karaite author does not concur with the one provided by Pliny the Elder, our main source for the reconstruction of that process. It is nevertheless likely that the author acquired his information from Jewish purple dyers, yet apparently failed to reproduce it entirely or accurately.⁴⁰ Purple dyeing in Byzantium was not exclusively performed with murex purple, and even dyers working for the imperial court utilized substitute purples. We do not know which colorants were used by a Jewish dyer, attested by a Genizah letter dated to c. 1082–1094, who worked for a private customer at an unknown location in the Empire.⁴¹ The testimony bearing on his activity is nevertheless precious, since it corroborates the indirect evidence about Jewish silk dyers offered by the Karaite work, the model of which was composed in the eleventh century, as noted above. The same work also refers to Jewish embroiderers executing motifs designed by Gentiles, i.e. Christians in the Byzantine context. It is not excluded that economic considerations compelled Jews to adorn textiles not only with secular, but also with

³⁸ On Byzantine half-silks, see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 474–475.

³⁹ Jacob ben Reuben, *Sefer ha-Osher*, commentary on Exodus 25:4.

⁴⁰ On the production of purple colors in Antiquity, including murex purple, see G. Steigerwald, 'Die antike Purpurfärberei nach dem Bericht Plinius' des Älteren in seiner "Naturalis Historia", *Traditio*, 42 (1986), pp. 1–57, and *idem*, 'Die Purpursorten im Preisedikt Diokletians vom Jahre 301', *Byzantinische Forschungen*, 15 (1990), pp. 219–276, which supersede all previous studies on the subject. On the Talmudic description, which also includes the testing of the dye, see I. Herzog, 'Hebrew Porphyrology', London 1913, ed. M. Ron, 1986, in E. Spanier (ed.), *The Royal Purple and the Biblical Blue. Argaman and Tekhelet. The Study of Chief Rabbi Dr. Isaac Herzog on the Dye Industry in Ancient Israel and Recent Scientific Contributions*, Jerusalem, 1987, p. 99. There is no evidence about Jewish purple fishers in the Empire, as for twelfth-century Egypt: see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 493 and n. 232.

⁴¹ See *ibid.*, pp. 482–483.

Christian motifs, in the same way as they prompted them to manufacture and handle fabrics combining two different types of yarns, contrary to biblical prescriptions.⁴² Silk fabrics were most likely included among the embroidered materials.⁴³ We have already noted that the location at which this Karaite biblical commentary was composed remains unknown. In any event, there is good reason to believe that its references to silk, dyeing and embroidery were also relevant for Constantinople.

From the sources examined so far we may already draw two conclusions. First, Jews worked in the silk industry of Constantinople since the eleventh century, thus long before the visit of Benjamin of Tudela; secondly, these Jews were involved in several stages of the industrial process, namely the dyeing of silk fibers or fabrics,⁴⁴ their weaving, and the tailoring of garments. It remains to determine in what framework they exercised their respective crafts. In tenth century Constantinople the manufacture of silk fabrics and vestments took place either in imperial or in private workshops.⁴⁵ Although not documented, the continuous existence of imperial ateliers since the tenth century, when they are last attested, until the Fourth Crusade may be taken for granted. Indeed, there was no reason for them to disappear. Benjamin of Tudela would not have failed to mention the employment of Jews in an imperial establishment of Constantinople, had this been the case, all the more so since in Thebes, where no such atelier existed, Jews exercised their activity in private workshops.⁴⁶ We may thus conclude that, similarly, the Jewish silk workers of Constantinople exercised their craft in private ateliers.

From the tenth century 'Book of the Eparch' we know that workers engaged in silk manufacture in the private workshops of the capital could register in the guild of the *serikarioi*, who basically were silk weavers,⁴⁷ or that of the *katartarioi*, who apparently dealt with the degumming of raw

⁴² Commentary on Exodus 38:23. Contrary to Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, p. 174, n. 24, the text definitely alludes to the execution of Christian designs by Jews.

⁴³ On embroidered silks, see above, p. 9.

⁴⁴ The Jewish dyer mentioned earlier handled a silk fabric: see above, p. 11. Yet mostly dyeing took place before weaving: see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 458, 472, n. 108, 481–485.

⁴⁵ On the imperial workshops: Constantine Porphyrogenitus, *Three Treatises on Imperial Expeditions*, ed. and trans. J. Haldon (Corpus Fontium Historiae Byzantinae, XXVIII), Wien, 1990, pp. 108–110, Text C, lines 225–260; Lopez, 'Silk Industry in the Byzantine Empire', pp. 6–7.

⁴⁶ On Thebes, see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 467–468.

⁴⁷ Imperial officers affixed lead seals to their fabrics and inspected their looms: EB 8.3. In this context 'Webkontrolleur' for *μυτωτής*, as suggested by Simon, 'Die byzantinischen Seidenzünfte', p. 24, is more appropriate than 'Fädeninspektor', as in Koder's translation. On looms, see also EB 8.12 and 13.

silk.⁴⁸ Interestingly, the mid-eleventh century legal compendium known as *Peira* mentions together the guilds (σωματεία) of the *metaxopratai*, the *prandiopratai* or merchants of foreign manufactured silk goods, and that of the dyers.⁴⁹ This last body is one of several corporations absent from the extant version of the 'Book of the Eparch', which clearly does not contain the regulations of all the guilds existing in tenth-century Constantinople. In any event, Jewish silk workers or dyers do not appear as guild members in the 'Book of the Eparch', nor in any other source. One might argue that there was no reason to single them out within these corporative bodies, yet it is more likely that they were barred from entering them. There was at least one compelling reason preventing Jews from enlisting in the Constantinopolitan guilds: at various occasions these bodies performed religious functions in which Jews could definitely not participate, as in the church of Hagia Sophia.⁵⁰

In order to explain the absence of Jewish silk workers from the guilds of Constantinople, it has been suggested that they were enrolled in a separate Jewish guild.⁵¹ A novel issued by Emperor Manuel I Comnenus in 1148

⁴⁸ See Simon, 'Die byzantinischen Seidenzünfte', pp. 24–33, 45. According to Simon, loc. cit., pp. 35–36, 39–40, the *melathrarioi*, mentioned in EB 6.15, possibly had a guild of their own. The underlying assumption is that all silk workers belonged to guilds, which was clearly not the case: see my forthcoming study mentioned above, n. 6. A. Muthesius, 'The Byzantine Silk Industry: Lopez and beyond', *Journal of Medieval History*, 19 (1993), pp. 29–40, repr. in *eadem*, *Studies in Byzantine and Islamic Silk Weaving*, no. XVI, offers some useful suggestions about the technical aspects of silk production, yet her data and her interpretations of guild regulations are far from reliable, for instance with respect cocoons, on which see above, n. 7; consequently, her study should be used with extreme caution. The relation between guilds and division of labor in the industrial process has not yet been fully clarified and requires further research.

⁴⁹ *Peira* 51.7, in J. and P. Zepos, *Jus graecoromanum*, Athens, 1931, IV, p. 213; see also *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, ed. A.P. Kazhdan, Oxford, 1991, III, pp. 666–667, s. v. Dyer.

⁵⁰ On these functions, see P. Schreiner, 'Die Organisation byzantinischer Kaufleute und Handwerker', in H. Jankuhn und E. Ebel (eds.), *Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa*, VI: *Organisation der Kaufmannsvereinigungen in der Spätantike und im frühen Mittelalter* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philos.-histor. Kl., 3. Folge, 183), Göttingen, 1989, pp. 47–48; S. Vryonis, Jr., 'Byzantine ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ and the Guilds in the Eleventh Century', *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 17 (1963), pp. 300, 302 and n. 47, 303–304, 309, repr. in *idem*, *Byzantium: Its Internal History and Relations with the Muslim World*, London, 1971, no. III.

⁵¹ See Lopez, 'Silk Industry', pp. 23–24, esp. 24, n. 4. Lopez' hypothesis becomes a fact in Ankori, *Karaites in Byzantium*, pp. 140–143, 145–146, 149–150, 172, 176–177, though still without any documentary basis. The same holds true of the statement by A. Sharf, *Byzantine Jewry from Justinian to the Fourth Crusade*, London 1971, pp. 117–118, that by the eleventh century the guilds of silk workers in Thebes and Thessalonica 'had a substantial Jewish membership'.

records the formula of a Jewish oath resting on an existing copy of the 'Book of the Eparch' (παρεξεβλήθη 'απὸ τοῦ Ἐπαρχικοῦ Βιβλίου), most likely preserved at the Eparch's office.⁵² This Jewish oath, so runs the argument, may have been related to the entrance ceremony of a new guild member, like the oath imposed on those joining the guild of notaries.⁵³ However, both the nature and purpose of the two oaths widely differed. In addition, we have to remember that in the twelfth century the Eparch still retained wide jurisdiction in civil litigation and criminal matters, in addition to market control.⁵⁴ And, finally, the inclusion of the oath in the emperor's rescript was prompted precisely by a civil suit opposing a converted Jew of Attaleia to his former community. It follows that the Jewish oath appeared in a copy of the 'Book of the Eparch' existing in 1148 because it was used in regular court proceedings in the capital, without any connection whatsoever with guild membership. In any event, it is inconceivable that in the Byzantine Empire, in which the official policy towards the Jews was strongly influenced by the negative attitude of the Church,⁵⁵ the state should have established, recognized or tolerated non-Orthodox professional guilds, let alone Jewish ones.

We may now return to the Jews mentioned in the 'Book of the Eparch' who, while not being professional merchants, nevertheless sold silk as raw material to aliens exporting it from Constantinople. Two questions arise in that context: what was the precise occupation of these Jews, and how did it enabled them to get hold of the silk they handled. The silk supply to the workshops of the capital was channelled through an institutionalized and state controlled network, in which guild members only participated. The *metaxopratai* or silk merchants shared with the wealthy *katartarioi* a virtual monopoly in the purchase of imported raw silk and cocoons and in the distribution of these commodities in Constantinople. In the second stage, only individuals belonging to three groups were allowed to acquire the raw materials for processing: the *serikarioi*, the poor *katartarioi*, and the *melathrarioi*, who presumably dealt with the spinning of waste and floss silk.⁵⁶ It should be stressed that these silk workers were not professional

⁵² The Jewish oath has been re-edited and discussed by E. Patlagean, 'Contribution juridique à l'histoire des Juifs dans la Méditerranée médiévale: les formules grecques de serment', *Revue des études juives*, 4e série, 4 (1965), pp. 138–140, 143–147, repr. in *eadem*, *Structure sociale, famille, chrétienté à Byzance*, London, 1981, no. XIV.

⁵³ The formula appears in EB 1.3.

⁵⁴ See P. Magdalino, *The Empire of Manuel I Komnenos, 1143–1180*, Cambridge, 1993, p. 230.

⁵⁵ See Jacoby, 'Les Juifs de Byzance', pp. 117–126.

⁵⁶ EB 6.8, 7.2 and 6.9, 8.8, 6.15, respectively. On the *melathrarioi*, see Muthesius, 'The Byzantine Silk Industry', pp. 32–33. In the Empire the fabric made from spun waste or floss

merchants. Nevertheless, the 'Book of the Eparch' expressly refers to *katartarioi* illegally selling silk or cocoons without processing them or acting as strawmen for *archontes* or powerful and rich men of the capital.⁵⁷ It appears, then, that weavers, degummers and spinners of waste and floss silk bought silk or cocoons and took advantage of their skills to process these commodities and sell them with added value to unauthorized buyers. Among these were members of the social élite and foreign traders, the latter surely preferring semi-processed or processed silk to cocoons. We may infer, therefore, that the Jews connected to the illicit export of silk belonged to one or several of the three groups of silk workers just mentioned. The presence of Jewish silk weavers in tenth-century Constantinople does not come as a surprise, if we remember that they are attested there in the eleventh century.⁵⁸ To these artisans we may now tentatively add degummers and spinners. It still remains to determine, though, how these Jewish workers could acquire silk or cocoons from the *metaxopratai* or the *katartarioi*, despite not being registered in one of the silk workers' guilds.

A careful reading of the sources reveals that the manufacture of silk textiles in Constantinople was not restricted to guild members. Hired workers (*μισθωτοί*) also participated in this process by exercising their crafts in the workshops of the *serikarioi*. For instance, weavers were engaged on a monthly basis to work the looms of their employers.⁵⁹ Salaried workers were also active in the ateliers established by members of the social elite. The latter used the services of guild members, whether *metaxopratai* or *katartarioi*, to acquire within the institutionalized and state sanctioned trade network the silk they needed in order to produce fabrics and garments for sale.⁶⁰ Yet, in addition, there were independent dyers, weavers and tailors not registered in a guild nor working in the atelier of a guild member or an *archon*, who executed on their own or on other

silk was called *koukoularikon*: see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 474, 496. A red garment made of this fabric is mentioned in a Jewish marriage contract drafted in 1022 at Mastaura, in the Meander valley, Asia Minor: new edn. by N. De Lange, *Greek Jewish Texts from the Cairo Genizah* (Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum, 51), Tübingen, 1996, p. 6, line 30.

⁵⁷ EB 7.1. Similarly, some *metaxopratai* sold silk or cocoons directly to these individuals or bought the merchandise on their behalf: EB 6.10. We may postulate the identity of *archontes*, *dynatoi* and *plousioi*, three terms appearing in these and other provisions: see Simon, 'Die byzantinischen Seidenzünfte', pp. 40–44.

⁵⁸ See above, p. 10.

⁵⁹ EB 8.7, 8.10 and 8.12. On the hiring of artisans, see also Simon, 'Die byzantinischen Seidenzünfte', pp. 34–35, who convincingly argues that the *serikopratai* were identical with the *serikarioi*.

⁶⁰ EB 6.10 and 7.1, 8.2, 4.2, respectively.

premises the work commissioned by *serikarioi*, *archontes*, entrepreneurs, merchants or other customers, the latter in order to supply their own needs.⁶¹ These craftsmen either took advantage of their private connections to purchase the raw material they needed, or else were supplied with some or all of them by those ordering the work. A contractual relationship between independent craftsman and customer is illustrated by the case of the Jewish silk dyer already mentioned above, who was active in the Empire between c. 1082 and 1094. A customer entrusted him with the dyeing of a precious silk fabric, and he thus worked by the piece.⁶²

Once we take into consideration the activity of hired and independent silk workers in the context of silk manufacture and trade in Constantinople, it is possible to explain the provision of the 'Book of the Eparch' concerning the Jews who sold silk to aliens. It appears that these were independent workers who acquired silk and cocoons, yet instead of utilizing all the raw material in their own ateliers sold semi-processed or processed silk to foreign traders. It is not excluded, however, that these as well as salaried Jewish silk workers also acted as intermediaries on behalf of guild members, whether *metaxopratai*, *serikarioi* or *katartarioi*, or else members of the social elite, merchants or entrepreneurs eager to profit from this illicit trade. These individuals may have used the Jewish silk workers as middlemen because of their easy access to foreign Jewish merchants. Whatever the case, by prohibiting the sale of silk to Jews and non-licensed merchants the imperial authorities attempted to close a loophole in the institutionalized network of silk supply. It is doubtful that the regulation could have ever been effectively enforced. In any event, it must have restricted the scope of the Jewish workers' initiative in silk production and increased their dependence on the supply of raw materials by customers, as well as on salaried work offered by employers such as the *serikarioi* and the *archontes*. Finally, it should be stressed that the provision concerning the Jews in the 'Book of the Eparch' is important in yet another way. It enables us to push back from the eleventh to the tenth century the date at which Jewish silk workers, among them weavers, dyers and possibly also degummers and spinners, are first documented in Constantinople, despite the absence of any direct reference to them. It is not excluded that they were to

⁶¹ M. Kaplan, 'Du cocon au vêtement de soie: concurrence et concentration dans l'artisanat de la soie à Constantinople aux Xe-XIe siècles, in ΕΥΨΥΧΙΑ. *Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler* (Byzantina Sorbonensia, 16) Paris, 1998, I, pp. 315-327, the latest author dealing with silk manufacture in Constantinople, fails to recognize the existence and activity of these independent workers. The whole issue of guild membership, hired workers and independent artisans will be examined elsewhere.

⁶² See above, p. 11.

be found in the city even earlier, as some regulations of the 'Book of the Eparch' were already implemented by the ninth century.⁶³

There is convincing evidence pointing to Jewish migration from Islamic countries into Byzantine Asia Minor and from this region toward Constantinople in the late tenth and early eleventh century.⁶⁴ Since the latter period social and economic factors generated a rising demand for silks in the Empire and necessitated an expansion of the work force in the capital's industry.⁶⁵ It is likely, therefore, that silk weavers and dyers were to be found among the Jewish immigrants settling in the city at that time. From later Genizah documents and other sources we may gather that until 1147 more of these workers joined the Jewish artisans employed in the silk industry of Constantinople. However, after the deportation of the Jewish silk workers from Thebes to Norman Sicily, which took place in that year, there appears to have been an emigration of Jewish silk artisans from the capital to the Boeotian city.⁶⁶

The silk weavers and tailors whom Benjamin of Tudela met in Constantinople shortly after 1160 exercised their craft, like the Jewish tanners, in the Jewish quarter located in the suburb of Pera. The Jewish traveler would not have failed to point to another location, had they worked elsewhere. It would seem, then, that these artisans operated independent workshops manufacturing textiles and garments, possibly for the imperial court, as implied by Benjamin's knowledge about the delivery of silks to the latter's warehouses, in any event for the open market. Unfortunately, the Jewish traveler does not specify whether the merchants and the rich men he encountered in the Jewish quarter were involved in any way in silk production or trade.⁶⁷ The Jewish quarter did not outlast the Fourth Crusade. It was destroyed by fire in 1203 in the course of the siege of Constantinople by the Latins. Shortly afterwards some of the surviving Jews settled within the city itself, where they are attested between late 1205 and early 1207.⁶⁸ It is hardly plausible that all the

⁶³ See my forthcoming study mentioned above, n. 6.

⁶⁴ See Jacoby, 'The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland', pp. 223–225.

⁶⁵ See Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 472–475, 477–478; also, yet without specific reference to silk, H. Ahrweiler, 'Recherches sur la société byzantine au XI^e siècle: nouvelles hiérarchies et nouvelles solidarités', *Travaux et Mémoires*, 6 (1976), pp. 99–124. Incidentally, the silk workers from Muslim countries settling in the Empire may have contributed to the dissemination of silk terminology, designs and technology, and to the production in the Empire of some types of Muslim weaves and clothing pieces: on terminology in particular, see Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', p. 458 and notes 32, 36.

⁶⁶ Jacoby, 'Silk in Western Byzantium', pp. 485–487.

⁶⁷ BT, Hebrew, p. 16. On the imperial warehouses, see above, p. 9.

⁶⁸ Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople', pp. 36–39.

Jewish silk workers active in 1203 should have perished in the fire that destroyed their quarter in that year, yet they are nevertheless not attested in Constantinople in the following period. On the other hand, the sources of the Palaeologan period mention Jewish tanners, like Benjamin of Tudela, as well as furriers working in the city.⁶⁹ The silence of the sources about Jewish silk workers appears to be related, therefore, to the fate of the entire silk industry of Constantinople after the Fourth Crusade.

There is good reason to believe that this industry did not survive the catastrophe that hit the city in 1203–1204. Huge fires inflicted heavy damage on the industrial infrastructure of Constantinople. The *prandiopratai* or retailers of foreign silk clothes had their shops in a segment of the Embolos,⁷⁰ which was destroyed, and though we have no indication about the location of silk workshops in the city, we may assume that they too suffered heavily.⁷¹ The Latin conquest was followed by a massive exodus of the city's population.⁷² While this movement was primarily motivated by the reluctance of Greeks to live under Latin rule, it also appears to have been generated by other factors. From the eleventh century until 1203 the growth of the silk industry in the city was promoted by the emperors, who subsidized production in their own workshops, as well as by the growing demand for various grades of silk fabrics, supplied by private manufacturers to the wealthy local elite and to a clientele belonging to lower social strata.⁷³ These two economic factors stimulating the silk industry disappeared in 1204. The impoverished Latin emperors were not in a position to re-activate the imperial workshops or to uphold their existence, the new Latin élite did not have resources comparable to those of their Byzantine predecessors, and the decline in population further restricted the market for cheaper grades of silk textiles.⁷⁴ Under the circumstances existing after the Latin conquest of 1204, the silk workers who wished to pursue their highly skilled activity had no choice but to leave the city and find employment elsewhere. It would seem, then, that

⁶⁹ D. Jacoby, 'Les quartiers juifs de Constantinople à l'époque byzantine', *Byzantion*, 37 (1967), pp. 189–205, repr. in *idem*, *Société et démographie à Byzance et en Romanie latine*, London, 1975, no. II.

⁷⁰ EB 5.2.

⁷¹ See Th. F. Madden, 'The Fires of the Fourth Crusade in Constantinople, 1203–1204: A Damage Assessment', *Byzantinische Zeitschrift*, 84/85 (1991–1992), pp. 72–93, esp. 79–83, 91 and map on p. 93. However, this study does not deal with the economic impact of the fires.

⁷² For the time being, see Jacoby, 'The Jewish Community of Constantinople', pp. 38–39; see also below, n. 74.

⁷³ See above, p. 17.

⁷⁴ I shall return to the subject in a forthcoming study on the economic evolution of Constantinople in the Latin period.

many silk workers, Greeks as well as Jews, left Constantinople, whether immediately or shortly afterwards.

The evidence bearing on silk in the Empire of Nicaea lends strong support to the assumption that these workers headed toward the remaining Byzantine territories in western Asia Minor. Sericulture appears to have been extensive in this region in the thirteenth century. The expansion of the silk industry in Nicaea between 1208 and 1261, the period during which the city served as capital of the Empire, was clearly stimulated by the encouragement and support provided by the emperors and the demand of the social elite.⁷⁵ This development is indirectly confirmed by Theodore Metochites. In his *Encomium of Nicaea* ("Νικαεύς"), composed presumably in 1290, he mentions silk deliveries to the imperial court.⁷⁶ It is fair to assume that the production of high-grade silks in Nicaea after the Fourth Crusade would not have been possible without the arrival of expert silk workers from Constantinople, among them Jews who, as suggested above, had apparently delivered some of their products to the imperial warehouses before 1203. From Theodore Metochites we learn that Nicaea retained its silk industry and continued to supply the needs of the imperial court after the recovery of Constantinople in 1261. In other words, there was no transfer nor any return of silk artisans or workshops from Nicaea to Constantinople, in any event within the thirty years extending from that date to the composition of the *Encomium of Nicaea*.⁷⁷

We may now sum up our findings. The evidence gathered above reveals that the twelfth-century account of Benjamin of Tudela is not the only source documenting the connection of Jews with the silk industry of Constantinople. Jewish involvement in the silk trade is sparsely attested. On the other hand, there appears to have been a more or less continuous participation of highly skilled Jewish artisans in the various stages of the capital's silk manufacture, even the most sophisticated ones, as well as in the production of silk garments since the tenth century, if not earlier, until 1203. The Jewish workers,

⁷⁵ On the Empire of Nicaea, see M. Angold, *A Byzantine Government in Exile: Government and Society under the Lascarids of Nicaea (1204–1261)*, Oxford, 1975. On the city of Nicaea, see C. Foss, *Nicaea. A Byzantine Capital and its Praises*, Brookline, Mass., 1996, pp. 57–73. I shall deal extensively with sericulture and silk manufacture in the Empire of Nicaea in my forthcoming book mentioned above, n. 6.

⁷⁶ Theodore Metochites: *Nicene Oration*, new ed. and trans. by Foss, *Nicaea*, pp. 190–192, chap. 18, lines 12–17. For the dating of this text, see I. Ševčenko, *Études sur la polémique entre Théodore Métrochite et Nicéphore Choumnos*, Bruxelles, 1962, pp. 137–140.

⁷⁷ See previous note.

however, never gained access to the silk guilds and remained in a state of economic dependency with respect to the guild members, *archontes* and entrepreneurs employing them. The subordinate position of the Jewish silk weavers was reinforced at one point in the ninth or early tenth century, when the imperial government denied them the right to buy silk. The number of Jewish silk workers in Constantinople presumably increased as a result of immigration from Asia Minor and Muslim countries from the end of the tenth century until 1147, yet apparently decreased afterwards. The Latin siege and conquest of Constantinople in 1203–1204 generated the emigration of silk workers, including Jews, from the capital to the Byzantine state of Nicaea and prompted thereby the expansion of the industry in that region. The successors of these workers continued to ply their trades in Nicaea even after the restoration of Byzantine rule over Constantinople in 1261. Unfavorable economic conditions appear to have prevented the renewal of silk manufacture in the capital.⁷⁸ These developments explain why Jewish silk workers are no more attested in Constantinople after 1204, neither during its occupation by the Latins which lasted until 1261, nor in the following Palaeologan period.

⁷⁸ On this subject, see my forthcoming study mentioned above, n. 6.

ADDENDA AND CORRIGENDA

Only mistakes impairing the understanding or accuracy of text and notes are corrected below. For that reason the faulty division of words into syllables, maintained by editors and printers despite proper corrections of the proofs, has not been revised. Such mistakes as well as others are numerous in article X, for which no proofs were available. The bibliographical information has been updated wherever possible.

II – Byzantine Crete in the Navigation and Trade Networks of Venice and Genoa

- p. 519, n. 6, lines 3–4: *instead of Venice: Society and Crusade. Studies in Honor of Donald Queller* [in press] *read* E.E. KITTEL and Th. F. MADDEN (eds.), *Medieval and Renaissance Venice*, Urbana and Chicago, 1999, pp. 49–68.
- p. 523, n. 19, line 3: *insert I, before* p. 47.
- p. 530, para. 2, lines 15–16: My statement that the Genoese first appeared in Romania at the time of the First Crusade should be corrected in the light of a recently published Genizah letter written at Alexandria in the summer of 1062, which mentions Cretan and Genoese traders acting together: ed. and Hebrew trans. by M. Gil, *Be-malkhut Yishma'el bi-teqfat ha-geonim* [= *In the Kingdom of Ishmael*], Jerusalem, 1997, IV, pp. 445–450, no. 749, lines 1–6; English trans. by S. Simonsohn, *The Jews of Sicily, Volume I, 383–1300*, Leiden, 1997, pp. 314–316, no. 145. The letter implies that Crete was already serving as a transit station between Genoa and Alexandria by the 1060s.

III – Les Juifs de Byzance: une communauté marginalisée

- p. 149, n. 105, line 1: *instead of* Ἀνάχαρις *read* Ἀνάχαρσις
- p. 149, n. 105, line 2: *before* pp. 259–260 *insert* 1984,
- p. 150, text, line 6 from the bottom: *instead of* consiles *read* conciles
- p. 150, n. 106: *add*, pp. 26–33.

IV – The Jews of Constantinople and their Demographic Hinterland

- p. 223, n. 3: the study by Jacoby is reproduced as article III in this volume.
- p. 227, line 5: *instead of* 1093 *read* 1092
- p. 227, n. 22: *instead of* (1994) [forthcoming] *read* (1998), pp. 32–34. This study is reproduced as article V in this volume
- p. 227, n. 26: the study mentioned as being ‘in press’ has not been published as announced and appears for the first time as article XI in this volume.

- p. 228, n. 27: this study is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, Variorum Reprints, 1997, as article VII.
- p. 228, n. 34, line 1: *between 152 and For the dating insert*, ll. 21–22; revised text and trans. in C. Foss [and] J. Tulchin, *Nicaea. A Byzantine Capital and Its Praises* (Brookline, Mass., 1996), p. 208, l. 12–p. 210, l. 17.

V – The Jewish Community of Constantinople from the Komnenan to the Palaiologan Period

- p. 32, n. 7: this study is reproduced as article III in this volume.
- p. 32, n. 8: this study is reproduced as article IV in this volume.
- p. 39, n. 59: the study mentioned, as being 'in press' was not been published as announced and appears for the first time as article XI in this volume.

VI – The Venetian Presence in the Latin Empire of Constantinople (1204–1261): the Challenge of Feudalism and the Byzantine Inheritance

- p. 153, n. 40, line 4: *instead of second read first*.
- p. 169, line 14: *instead of Jacobus or Giacomo read Johannes or Giovanni*.
- p. 184, n. 146: *instead of 109–109 read 108–109*.
- p. 185, n. 150, line 4: *instead of I 558, and II 4 read I 560 and II 7*
- p. 187, line 16: *instead of Giacomo read Giovanni*, the latter maintaining his residence in Constantinople.
- p. 189, line 14: read Thiband V of Champagne.

VII – Venetian Settlers in Latin Constantinople (1204–1261): Rich or Poor?

- p. 184, n. 9: the study is reproduced as article VI in this volume.
- p. 185, n. 16, line 3: *instead of Takács (éds.) read Takács (eds.)*.
- p. 198, n. 81, lines 3–4: *between Petron and All the debts insert J.-M. Martin, E. Cuozzo, Bernadette Martin Hisard, "Un acte de Baudouin II en faveur de l'abbaye cistercienne de Sainte-Marie De Percheio (octobre 1241)", Revue des Études Byzantines, 57 (1999), pp. 211–223, suggest a different localisation of the monastery, namely within the Patriarchate (pp. 227–228)*.
- p. 200, n. 88, lines 5–6: *instead of Eastern Mediterranean, Athens, 1997, nn. 46–49 (in press) read Eastern Mediterranean, 12th–17th Centuries]* (The National Hellenic Research Foundation, Institute for Byzantine Research, Byzantium Today, 2), Athens, 1998, p. 117.
- p. 203, text, line 3 from bottom, *instead of pullion read bullion*.

VIII – From Byzantium to Latin Romania: Continuity and Change

- p. 35, n. 16, line 1: *instead of Gregory read Gregory II*.
- p. 44, n. 116, line 5: *delete 159*.

IX – Italian Migration and Settlement in Latin Greece: The Impact on the Economy

- p. 99, n. 6: the second study by Jacoby is reproduced as article VIII in this volume.
- p. 100, n. 8: this study is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, Variorum Reprints, 1997, as article VII.
- p. 103, n. 13: this study is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping*, as article VIII.
- p. 104, text, last line: *instead of florins read ducats*.
- p. 105, line 2: *instead of 1209 read 1204*.
- p. 106, line 2: *instead of 1301 read late in 1302*.
- p. 106, n. 26: *add* New dating late in 1302 by *Andreas Kiesewetter*, *Das Ende des Livre de la conquête de l'Amorée (1301–1304). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des fränkischen Griechenland zu Beginn des 14. Jahrhunderts*, in: *Byzantiaka*, 16 (1996), 157–161, 184.
- p. 107, n. 30, line 4: *after Duecento insert 700*.
- p. 111, n. 53, line 2: *instead of The Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean (Athens 1997) [in press]. read The Balkans and the Eastern Mediterranean, 12th–17th Centuries (Athens 1998), 114–119*.
- p. 116, line 2: *instead of Prince Philip of Taranto read Prince Philip I of Taranto*.
- p. 117, line 9, *instead of husband read son*.
- p. 119, n. 85: *instead of Sandra Origone (ed.), Le vie del Mediterraneo. Idee, uomini, oggetti (secoli XI–XVI) (Genova 1996) [in press]. read Gabriella Airaldi (ed.), Le vie del Mediterraneo. Idee, uomini, oggetti (secoli XI–XVI) (Università degli studi di Genova, Collana dell'Istituto di storia del medioevo e della espansione europea, n. 1) (Genova 1997), 68–70, reproduced as article X in this volume*.
- p. 125, n. 116: *add* Sugar cultivation failed in Crete: see *David Jacoby*, *La production du sucre en Crète vénitienne: l'échec d'une entreprise économique*, in: *Chryssa Maltezou, Th. Detorakes, Chr. Charalampakes (eds.), ΠΟΛΩΝΙΑ. Τιμή στον Μ.Ι. Μανούσακα [Rhodonia. Homage to M.I. Manoussakas], Rethymno (Crete), 1994, I, 167–180*.
- p. 127, lines 9–10: *instead of Byzantine read some*.

X – Silk Crosses the Mediterranean

- p. 55, n. 2: the study by Jacoby is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, Variorum Reprints, 1997, as article VII.
- p. 57, col. 1, line 4: *between Giustiniano and mentioned insert Partecipazio*, drafted in 829, listed a piece of sendal adorned with gold embroidery and perls. Somewhat later, in 853, the will of the bishop of Olivolo, Orso Partecipazio
- p. 58, n. 18, line 2: *after (1994), add pp. 140–142*.
- p. 58, n. 18, lines 3–5: *instead of in A. Lambropoulou ... [in press] read published for the first time as article no. XI in this volume*.

- p. 58, n. 22, lines 5–6: *instead of* S.D. Goitoin... *until* end of note *read* S.D. Goitein, *A Mediterranean Society. The Jewish Communities of the Arab World as Portrayed in the Documents of the Cairo Geniza*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1967–1993, I, pp. 102, 223–224.
- p. 65, col. 1, line 8: *instead of* Arabic terms *read* terms derived from Arabic place names
- p. 65, n. 64: this study is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping*, as article V.
- p. 67, n. 87: *add* New ed. by D. Puncuh, *I Libri Iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, II 2 (Fonti per la storia della Liguria, IV), Genova, 1996, p. 22, no. 285.
- p. 68, n. 91: this study is reproduced as article VIII in this volume.
- p. 69, n. 95, line 3: *after haberi add* ; new ed. by Sabina Dellacasa, *I Libri Iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, II/4 (Fonti per la storia della Liguria, XI), Genova, 1998, pp. 38–40, no. 671
- p. 70, n. 100, lines 2–3: *between* implies *and* involvement *insert* some of them at least retained part of their property and possibly continued their
- p. 71, col. 1, lines 13–16: *instead of* the first city to produce silks on an industrial scale and for a long time their leading producer in the Latin West. *read* the first city in the Latin West to produce sophisticated silks on an industrial scale and for a long time their leading producer in that region.
- p. 71, col. 2, line 6: *instead of* friezes *read* embroidery.
- p. 72, col. 1, line 19: *instead of* Alfonso VII *read* Alfonso VIII
- p. 73, col. 2, line 12: *instead of* Bugia *read* Bougie
- p. 73, n. 117: *add* New ed. by A. Rovere, *I Libri Iurium della Repubblica di Genova*, I/1 (Fonti per la storia della Liguria, II), Genova, 1992, pp. 236–237, no. 162.
- p. 73, n. 121: the study by Jacoby is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping in the Medieval Mediterranean*, Aldershot, Variorum Reprints, 1997, as article VIII.
- p. 75, text, col. 1, lines 4–5: *instead of* in all likelihood originating in Marv Shahidjan, Khorasan, *read* possibly originating in Marv, Turkmenistan,
- p. 75, col. 2, two last lines: *instead of* by a charter *read* in 1210 and
- p. 75, n. 131, lines 5–6: *instead of* On its origin... 89–92 *read* Heyd, *Histoire du commerce*, II, p. 673, followed by several other authors, mentions Marv Shahidjan as place of origin, which is impossible since Marv is in Turkmenistan and Shahidan at a distance of several hundred km. in Afghanistan.
- p. 75, n. 133: *instead of* G. Pistarino *read* L. Balletto. The study is reproduced in D. Jacoby, *Trade, Commodities and Shipping*, as article IV.
- p. 76, text, col. 1, lines 3–4 from bottom: *instead of* southwest, south and south-east *read* west, south-southwest and south-southeast
- p. 76, n. 141, line 2: *between* ‘Djurdjan’ and M. Balard *insert* or Gorgan in Iran
- p. 76, n. 141, lines 5–6: *instead of* who, however, writes *read* who correctly refers to
- p. 79, col. 2, lines 2–3: *between* Constantinople in and 1261 *insert* the Black Sea.¹⁶⁷
In any event, the Byzantine recovery of Constantinople in
- p. 79, n. 166, line 1: *instead of* above, n. 138. *read* the article by Balard mentioned above, n. 138, and for Constantinople in particular D. Jacoby, “Venetian Settlers in

Latin Constantinople (1204–1261): Rich or Poor?” (reproduced as article VII in this volume), pp. 198–199.

For an extensive treatment of Genoese and Venetian involvement in silk trade and production until the first half of the fourteenth century, see now D. Jacoby, “Genoa, Silk Trade and Silk Manufacture in the Mediterranean region (ca. 1100–1300)”, in A.R. Calderoni Masetti, C. Di Fabio, M. Marcenaro (eds.), *Tessuti, oreficerie, miniature in Liguria, XIII–XV secolo* (Istituto internazionale di Studi liguri, Atti dei Convegni, III), Bordighera, 1999, pp. 11–40, and D. Jacoby, “Dalla materia prima ai drappi tra Bisanzio, il Levante e Venezia: la prima fase dell’industria serica veneziana”, in L. Molà, R.C. Mueller, C. Zanier (eds.), *La seta in Italia dal Medioevo al Seicento. Dal baco al drappo*, Venezia, 2000, pp. 265–304.

INDEX

Individuals and families are listed either under their name, surname (dynastic, topographical, or other), or the name of their lordship. Names having both a French and an English version appear under the latter (e.g. Marie under Mary, Égypte under Egypt), yet the names of Italian individuals are italianized (e.g. Pietro instead of Peter). The terms Arabs, Franks, Greeks, Latins and Muslims, mentioned throughout several studies, as well as the names of ecclesiastical institutions, except for religious orders, have been omitted. All *geographic names* are included, except often recurring ones such as Aegean, Greece, Levant, Mediterranean, Romania and the West. Location is according to present state boundaries, except for Asia Minor, Cilician Armenia, Crete, Epirus and the Peloponnese. Location outside Byzantium or former Byzantine territories is given only when necessary. *Important subjects* are also included in the index.

Abbreviations: A. M. = Asia Minor; Byz. = Byzantine; CP = Constantinople; co. = company; emp. = emperor; empr. = empress; fam. = family; Flor. = Florentine; Gen. = Genoese; Jew. = Jewish; k./K. = king/Kingdom of; Pelop. = Peloponnese; q. = queen of; res. = resident of; Sien. = Sienese; Ven. = Venetian.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>Abydos (A. M.): VI 164; XI 5; <i>see also</i>
Dardanelles</p> <p>Acciaiuoli, Flor. banking co.:
IX 115–18, 122, 124</p> <p>Acciaiuoli di Nicola: IX 117</p> <p>Angelo: IX 124</p> <p>Dardano di Tingo: IX 117</p> <p>Donato, brother of Nerio I: IX 105</p> <p>Giovanni, archbishop Patras: IX 115</p> <p>Jacopo di Donato, representative of
Nicola Acciaiuoli in Morea:
IX 115</p> <p>Lorenzo: IX 106, 124</p> <p>Nerio I, lord Athens and Corinth:
IX 104–5, 110</p> <p>Niccolò, lord in Morea: VIII 15, 30;
IX 104, 106, 115–17, 122–3,
125–6</p> <p>Acre/Akko (Israel): II 529, 536–7;
IV 222; VII 204; X 64–5, 77–8</p> <p>Adramyttion (A. M.): I 90; II 535;
VI 164–5</p> <p>Adrianople (Turkey): II 524; VI 143,
150–51, 156</p> <p>Adriatic Sea: II 531; XI 7</p> <p>Aelia Capitolina: III 110; <i>see also</i>
Jerusalem</p> <p>Africa: IV 222; XI 2; <i>see also</i> Maghreb</p> | <p>Agnes of France, Byz. empr., later wife
of Theodore Branas: VI 151</p> <p>Alamanno da Costa, Gen. corsair: II 537</p> <p>Aleppo (Syria): I 90; sultan of: VI 188</p> <p>Alexandria (Egypt): I 88–9, 91–4; II 518,
521–4, 526, 528–30, 534,
536–7; V 34, 36; VIII 28, 43;
X 65, 73, 75</p> <p>Alfonso VIII, k. Castile: X 72</p> <p>Allemano, Enrico, res. CP: VI 164</p> <p>Almeria (Spain): X 61, 63</p> <p>Amadeo of Savoy, claimant to Frankish
Morea: IX 106</p> <p>Amalfi, Amalfitans: I 91–4; II 523–4;
V 34–5; IX 101; X 57–8, 63, 67;
XI 5, 7</p> <p>Anastasius II, pope: X 60</p> <p>Anastasius of Sinai, St., theologian:
III 140–41</p> <p>Anatolia: <i>see</i> Asia Minor</p> <p>Ancona, Anconitans: IX 107; X 79</p> <p>Andravidia (Pelop.): IX 105, 116, 126</p> <p>Andreas, archbishop Bari: IV 226</p> <p>Andros, island (Greece): II 533; IX 101;
X 61–3</p> <p>Angelus, Byz. imperial dynasty
Alexius III, emp.: VI 148;
VIII 16</p> |
|--|---|

- Constantine: II 535
 Anjou (France): VI 189
 Antalya: *see* Attaleia
 Antelmus, Latin archbishop Patras: X 68
 Antioch, city, principality of: I 94;
 II 529, 532; III 122–3, 143;
 IV 223; V 35; X 63–4, 78
 Apokaukos, Byz. governor Crete: II 535
 John, archbishop Naupactus: VIII 34
 Apulia: II 529; III 133; X 66, 68
archontes: II 520; VIII 4, 6–12, 18–19,
 22, 24, 26–9, 33, 35;
 IX 99–100, 127; X 69–70;
 XI 15–16, 20
 Arechi II, Lombard duke, later prince
 Benevento: X 56; *see also*
 Benevento
 Argolid (Pelop.): VIII 35
 Argos (Pelop.): IX 98–9, 109, 122
 Arkadia (Pelop.): VIII 35; IX 127
 Armenians: III 132
 Asbestas, Gregory, archbishop of
 Syracuse: III 125–6, 141–2
 Ascalon (Israel): V 33
 Asia Minor: I *passim*; II 523, 528, 531;
 III 124, 126, 128; IV 221–8;
 V 38; VI 165–6, 173, 175;
 VIII 40; X 61–2, 72, 75–6, 78;
 XI 17, 19–20
 Athanasios I, Patriarch CP: III 132, 139,
 146
 Athens: III 143; V 37; VI 173; VIII 13,
 15–16, 26, 35; IX 98–9, 104–10,
 118
 Attaleia (A. M.): I 87–8, 91; III 130;
 IV 225; V 36; X 75–6, 78; XI 7
 Attica (Greece): VIII 1, 3, 26; IX 97–8
 Aurius: *see* Orio
 Avignon: IX 115; X 72
 Ayas: *see* Laiazzo
- Babylonia: III 151
 Badoer, Giacomo, Ven. merchant CP:
 IV 230
 Baghdad: IV 227; X 65
 Balbo, Filippo, Lucchese merchant: X 72
 Baldwin I, Latin emp. CP (= Baldwin IX
 of Flanders): VI 143, 148, 151,
 164
 Baldwin II, Latin emp. CP: VI 148, 189;
 VII 193, 199, 201–2
 Balsamon, Theodore, Byz. canonist: I 90
 banking: VII 196–203; IX 107–118, 127;
 see also Acciaiuoli, Bardi,
 Bonaccorsi, Bonsignori, Cerchi
 Bianchi, Peruzzi, Riccardi,
 Scali, Scotti, Tolomei
 Bandini, Bannus di, member of
 Acciaiuoli co.: IX 117
 Bar Hebraeus (Gregory Abu'l-Faraj),
 Syriac scholar, historian: IV 223
 Barastro, Giovanni, Ven. res. CP: VI 164
 Barbadico/Barbarigo, Giovanni, Ven.
 res. CP: VI 164
 Barberio, Pietro, res. CP: VII 195
 Barcelona: IV 230; X 72
 Bardi, Flor. banking co.: IX 114–16
 Bari: I 94; II 531; III 130, 137; IV 226;
 X 57, 63; XI 5
 Barletta: IX 112
 Baroncelli, Flor. family: IX 124
 Aldobrando, representative of
 Angelo and Lorenzo Acciaiuoli
 in Morea: IX 115, 124, 126
 Silvestro, representative of Nicola
 Acciaiuoli in Morea: IX 115
 Barozzi, Angelo, Patriarch Grado:
 VI 185
 Pangrazio, his brother: VI 185
 Bartolomeo, priest and notary, res.
 Venice: VI 167
 Basil I, Byz. emp.: III 124–6; IV 223;
 XI 8
 Basil II, Byz. emp.: I 89; III 137; X 57;
 XI 5
 Becani, Megalotto, res. CP: VI 164
 Beccario, Rinaldo, res. Venice: IX 107
 Beirut: X 65, 77
 Belgium: X 56
 Bello, Raimondo, Ven. res. CP: VII 192,
 197, 201
 Rosa, his wife: VII 192
 Benedict, cardinal Santa Susanna: V 37
 Benedict XII, Pope: IX 115
 Benevento, principality of: X 66; *see*
 also Arechi II
 Benjamin of Tudela, Jew. traveller:
 III 121, 129, 134, 148–51, 153;
 IV 227–8; V 31–3, 36, 38–9;
 X 64; XI 1–2, 8–10, 12, 17–19
 Benoît of Sainte-Maure, author of
 Roman de Troie: X 62
 Béroul, Norman poet: X 62–3, 65
 Black Sea: IV 229; V 35; VII 182, 186;
 VIII 32; X 55, 59, 68, 75, 79
 Blanche of Castile, q. France:
 VII 199–200
 Boccacio, Giovanni: IX 106, 121
 Bodrum (A. M.): I 90
 Boeotia (Greece): III 133; VIII 1, 3;
 IX 97–8
 Boiano (Boyano), Nicola de, representa-

- tive of Mary of Bourbon in
Morea: VIII 13, 37; IX 122–3,
125–6
- Bokhara (Uzbekistan): X 56
- Bollani, Pasquale, res. CP: VII 193, 196
- Bologna: VI 161; X 71–2
- Bon/Bono, Giovanni, res. CP: VI 185;
VII 197
- Marco, Ven. res. CP: VII 197
- Bon de Monz, Tuscan banker CP:
VII 200
- Bonaccorsi, Flor. banking co.: IX 114,
116
- Lorenzo di Giovanni, member of
Acciaiuoli co.: IX 117
- Boniface of Montferrat, Latin k.
Thessalonica: VI 150
- Bonsignori, Sien. banking co.: IX 115
- Book of the Eparch/Prefect: I 86;
III 135–136; IV 227; XI 3–5, 7,
12–17
- Borion (Lybia): III 123
- Bosphorus: VII 191
- Bougie (Algeria): X 73
- Branas, Theodore, Byz. ruler of
Adrianople: VI 143, 151, 156
- Brienne: *see* Walter V
- Brindisi: IX 107, 123
- Brissano, Leonardo, res. CP: VII 195
- Bugari, Vitale, res. CP: VII 194–5
- Bulgaro, Guglielmo de, Gen. consul
Acre: X 78
- Buondelmonti, Flor. family: VII 200;
IX 124
- Andrea: IX 115
- Andrea di Ranieri: IX 118
- Gherardo: IX 115, 118
- Manente di Gherardo, representative
of Nicola Acciaiuoli in Morea:
IX 115
- Buonricoveri, Bivigliano di Manetto,
Flor., member of Acciaiuoli co.:
IX 117
- Burchard of Mount Sion, author of
pilgrimage guide: X 65
- Buzuto, Jacobo, representative of Nerio
Acciaiuoli in Morea: IX 123,
125
- Caesarea (Israel): III 111–12; VII 199
- Caffaro, Gen. historian: II 533
- Cairo: I 83, 84, 88, 92–3; II 523, 528–9;
IV 221, 224; V 32
- Cairo Genizah: I *passim*; II 521–3, 525,
528; III 127, 135; IV 221,
227–8, 230–31; V 32; X 58;
XI 2, 11, 17
- Calabria: II 537; X 61–2, 66, 74, 78
- Calcina, Pietro de la, res. CP: VII 188
- Campania (Italy): X 58
- Candia/Candida (Crete): II 520, 522,
529, 533–5, 537; VI 158, 184;
VIII 36–7; IX 124–5; *see also*
Guglielmo de
- Canea (Crete): VIII 31
- Cappadocia (A. M.): I 89
- Caracalla, Roman emp.: III 120
- Carea/Karea (A. M.): VI 181
- Carlassar (Dalmatia): VI 178
- Micha da, notary: VI 178
- Carthago: III 126, 134
- Casole, Greek monastery of (Terra
d'Otranto, Italy): V 37
- Caspian Sea: X 76
- Catalonia, Catalans, Catalan Company:
IV 229–30; VIII 31; IX 98–100,
103–5, 108–10, 114–5, 121
- Catherine of Valois, titular Latin empr.
CP, wife of Philip I of Taranto:
IX 115, 117
- Caucasus: X 55, 79
- Cephalonia, island (Greece): VIII 13
- Cerchi Bianchi, Flor. banking co:
IX 110, 114
- Ceuta: X 65
- Chalandritsa (Pelop.): IX 122
- Chalcedon, Church council of: III 111,
139
- Chalkoutzes, Michael, archon Euboia:
VIII 35
- Champagne: VII 200; X 79
- Chandax: *see* Candia
- Charlemagne: X 56, 60
- Charles I of Anjou, k. Sicily: VIII 7;
IX 97, 112
- Charles II, k. Sicily: VIII 7
- Cherson (Crimea, Ukraine): III 127, 145
- Chiarenza/Clarence (Pelop.): VIII 31;
IX 99, 103, 105–8, 110, 112–17,
120–21; X 70, 77
- China: X 56, 78–9; XI 5
- Chios, island, city (Greece): I 92; II 533;
III 128–9; IV 230; V 37
- Chomatianos, Demetrios, archbishop
Ohrid/of Bulgaria: III 132
- Chonae/Chonai (A. M.): III 123, 154;
IV 227
- Choniates, Michael, archbishop Athens:
III 143; VIII 26, 35
- Niketas, Byz. historian, his brother:
XI 8
- Chrétien of Troyes, French poet: X 63, 67

- Cilician Armenia: X 76, 78–9
 Cistercians: VII 198; VIII 41
 citizenship, nationality, naturalization:
 III 163; VI 163
 Clarence: *see* Chiarenza
 Cluny, abbey (France): X 57, 68; *see*
 also Odo
 Comnenus, Byz. imperial dynasty
 Alexius I: I 94; II 524; III 127;
 V 33–4; XI 8
 Andronicus I: III 122;
 Isaac: III 122
 John II: II 524, 526, 532; VIII 8
 Manuel I: I 90; II 526–7, 533–4,
 538; III 121, 148–9, 152;
 IV 227; V 32; VI 150; VIII 11,
 16; XI 13
 commodities:
 cheese: I 92; II 519, 521–2, 526–9,
 535–6; VIII 28, 30; IX 101–2;
 citrus IX 124–5
 cotton (raw material, cloth,
 industry): I 86; IX 102; X 56,
 61–3, 73–4, 78
 dyestuffs: I 8; VIII 30; IX 102, 104,
 120–21, 126; X 56–7, 60–61,
 64–5, 71, 76–78; XI 2, 8–9, 11
 glass (ingredients, vessels, industry):
 VIII 27, 31
 linen: I 85–6; IX 112; X 64, 74
 mastic: I 92
 medicinal plants: I 92
 oil: II 528–9; VIII 28, 30;
 IX 100–102, 125;
 perfumes: I 89
 salt: VI 179; IX 102, 116, 123,
 125–6;
 silk (raw material, cloth, industry):
 I 85–6, 95; II 525, 533;
 III 134–6; IV 222, 227–8;
 VI 181; VIII 27, 31;
 IX 100–105, 107, 113, 118–21,
 127; X *passim*; XI *passim*
 spices: I 89, 93; X 59
 sugar (cane, processed sugar,
 industry): IX 124
 grain, wheat: II 520, 532, 535;
 VI 150, 178; VIII 26, 28, 30;
 IX 104, 124;
 wine: I 95; II 520, 526, 529; VIII 26,
 30; IX 102, 124–6
 wool (raw material, cloth, industry):
 II 520, 535; VIII 26–7;
 IX 102, 112; X 61–2, 74, 77
 Constantine I, Byz. emp.: III 106, 111,
 113, 127, 139; IV 221
 Constantine V, Byz. emp.: III 115
 Constantine VII Porphyrogenetus, Byz.
 emp.: III 126
 Constantine VIII, Byz. emp.: I 90;
 III 137; X 57; XI 5
 Constantine IX Monomachus, Byz.
 emp.: III 128, 132; IV 224
 Constantine X: *see* Doukas
 Constantinople: I 87–8, 90–95; II 518,
 521–9, 531–5, 538–9; III 107,
 116, 127–8, 130–36, 142,
 146–8, 151, 153; IV *passim*;
 V *passim*; VI *passim*;
 VII *passim*; VIII 1, 6, 11, 24, 28,
 32; IX 97–8, 100–103, 114,
 121; X 56–8, 61–3, 67–8, 75–6,
 79; XI *passim*
 Byz. Patriarchs of CP: *see*
 Athanasios I, Gregory II of
 Cyprus, Luke Chrysoberges
 Latin Patriarch of CP: VI 143
 see also Book of the Eparch, Golden
 Horn, Pera
 Contarini, Andrea, Ven. doge: IX 104
 Cordoba, Caliphate of: X 58
 Corfu, island (Greece): II 525, 531;
 VI 157, 184, 197; VIII 6
 Corinth: VIII 14, 27, 30–31, 44;
 IX 101–5, 114, 116, 121, 124,
 126–7; X 61, 67
 Cornaro/Corner, Ven. fam.
 Niccolò, res. CP: VII 198
 Pietro, lord Argos and Nauplia:
 IX 122; *see also* Mary of
 Enghien
 Coron (Pelop.): III 3, 11, 16–17, 21, 37;
 VI 176; VIII 11, 37; IX 98–9,
 103, 120–22, 125; X 77
 Correr, Angelo, Ven. res. CP: VII 197
 Cosenza (Italy): X 74
 Cranea/Kranea (A. M.): VI 181
 Crete: II *passim*; III 148, 152; IV 229;
 VI 149–50, 157–62, 164,
 183–4, 188 198; VIII *passim*;
 IX 98, 101, 124–5, 127
 Crimea (Ukraine): X 79
 Crusades
 First: I 94; II 530; III 127; V 33–5;
 VI 145; VIII 102; X 59, 63–4
 Fourth: II 520, 540; III 152; IV 230;
 V 31, 36–7, 40; VI *passim*;
 VII 182; VIII 1–2, 11, 17, 21,
 28; IX 7–8, 100–103, 119;
 X 62, 67, 76, 78; XI 12, 17–19
 Cutrullus (Koutroules), Stephanus,
 Greek officer, Frankish Morea:

- VIII 12
 Cyclades, islands: II 533
 battle of: I 90
 Cyprus: II 537; III 122, 127; VIII 24;
 IX 116, 121, 124; X 65, 76
 Cyrenaica: III 123–4
- Dalle Carceri, Ravano, lord of Euboea:
 VIII 11; X 68
 Dalmatia: VI 172, 178
 Damascus: V 39
 Damaskinea (A. M.): VI 181
 Dandolo, Ven. fam.
 Andrea, doge: IX 104
 Enrico, doge: VI 144–6, 150, 152,
 154–5, 157, 159, 168, 188–9,
 193–4
 Marino, podestà CP: VI 168, 183,
 189, 193
 Raniero, vice doge: VI 156, 183, 194
 Dardanelles: II 521; VI 164, 166–7, 178,
 191; VII 184; XI 5
 Demenna (Sicily): X 67
 Desiderius, abbot Monte Cassino: X 58
 Djurdjan: *see* Gorgan
 Dolfín, Ranieri, Ven. envoy to CP:
 VI 168
 Dominicans: VIII 24, 41
 Donà, Andrea, Ven. res. CP: VII 192
 Doukas, Byz. imperial dynasty
 Alexius V Mourtzouphlous, emp.:
 VI 148
 Constantine X, emp.: III 128
 Michael VII, emp.: III 122
 Durazzo (Albania): II 524
 Alessio da: VI 164
 Teodoro da: VI 164
 Dyrrachion: *see* Durazzo
- Egypt: I *passim*; II 521, 523, 525,
 528–32, 534, 537; III 107–8,
 116, 127, 135; IV 226–8, 231;
 V 32–5; VIII 28; IX 101, 105–6;
 X 58, 61, 64, 66, 73; XI 3
 Elis (Pelop.): IX 105, 124
 Elisha/Elias bar Shinaya, Nestorian
 scholar, archbishop of Nisibin:
 III 119–20, 149
 Embriaco, G., Gen.: II 531
 Enghien, of: *see* Guy, Mary
 England: VI 188; IX 99, 111; X 74
 Epirus: VIII 24; *see also* Naupactus
 Escot: *see* Scotto
 Euboea: *see* Negroponte
 Euripos: *see* Negroponte
 Eusebius, bishop Caesarea: III 111–12
- Eustathius, archbishop Thessalonica:
 III 133
 Eustratios, St.: III 145
- Falier, Ven. fam.
 Benedetto, Patriarch Grado: VI 153,
 185; VII 190
 Otto, merchant: II 529
 Fatimids: *see* Egypt
 Ferbitore, Armanno, res. CP: VI 164
 Ferdinand of Maiorca, claimant to
 Frankish Morea: IX 116
 Ferro, Ven. fam.
 Angelo, res. CP: VII 201–3
 Giovanni, res. CP: VII 191, 201–3
 Vitale, res. CP: VII 191, 202
 Firmano, Berardo, res. CP: VII 193
 Flanders: IX 111; X 74
 Florence, Florentines: IX 105, 110–11,
 113, 115, 117–18, 120, 122,
 124, 127; X 77
 Florent of Hainault, prince Frankish
 Morea: VIII 7; IX 107
 Forzetti, Dino, member of Bardi co.:
 IX 116
 France: IX 98–9, 110; X 55
 Franciscans: VIII 24
 Frederick I of Hohenstaufen, emp.: X 67
 Frederick II of Hohenstaufen, emp.:
 X 65, 74
 Frisia (Netherlands): X 60
 Friuli (Italy): X 56
 Fustat (Old Cairo): *see* Cairo
- Gaeta, Gaetans: X 57–8, 63, 66; XI 7
 Galata: *see* Pera
 Galilee: III 105
 Gallipoli (Turkey): VI 146, 150–51, 160,
 164–6, 182, 187, 191, 193, 196
 Ganchi, Rustichello, Lucchese merchant:
 X 72
 Gandja (= Căcă, Azerbaijan): X 76, 78
 Gaul: III 134
 Gausoni, Ven. fam.
 Giovanni, merchant: VII 204
 Marco, podestà CP: VII 187–8
 Genoa, Genoese: II 518, 530–35,
 538–40; IV 229–30; V 37,
 39–40; VII 198–9; IX 101–2,
 107, 111, 118–20, 127; X 62–3,
 65–79
 Georgia: X 76, 78–9
 Georgius the Monemvasiote, res. CP:
 VII 193
 Gerald of Aurillac, St.: X 57–8
 Gerard of Stroem, Flemish (?) knight: VI

- 155, 162–3
Germany: IX 99; X 55, 62, 67, 71
Ghisi, Ven. fam.
 Andrea: IX 107
 Bartolomeo I, lord Tinos and
 Mykonos, baron Chalandritsa:
 IX 122
Gisberto, Biagio, Ven. res. CP: VII 194,
198
Golden Horn: III 131; VI 153; VII 187,
189–90, 196–7; *see also* Con-
stantinople
Gorgan, Iran: X 76, 78
Gradenigo, Ven. fam.
 Giacomo, res. CP: VI 187, 190
 Marco, military commander: IX 107
Grado, Patriarch, patriarchate of:
 VI 153, 160, 183, 185, 193;
 VII 184–5, 189–90, 194–7, 202;
 see also Barozzi, Angelo; Falier,
 Benedetto; Querini, Leonardo
Grasso, Giovanni, Ven.: IX 119
Grasso, Guglielmo, Gen., count Malta:
IX 119
Grasso: Gen (?) res. Thebes: IX 107
Grebeni (Pelop.): IX 123
Gregory II of Cyprus, Patriarch CP:
VIII 35
Gregory IV, pope: X 57
Grillo, Enrico, Gen. merchant: II 537
Grimaldi, Gen. ambassador to CP: II 535
Grizi (Pelop.): IX 123, 125
Guccio, Viviano, Sien. merchant: IX 110
Guglielmo da Candida, Gen. merchant:
II 533–4, 536, 539
Guglielmo, Gen. merchant Egypt: I 537
Guicciardini, Piero, member of
 Acciaiuoli co.: IX 115, 117
Guy of Enghien, lord Argos and Nauplia:
IX 122

al-Hakim, Fatimid caliph Egypt: I 87–8;
IV 223
Hadrian, Roman emp.: III 110–11
Hagios Nikolaos (Crete): VIII 38–40
Halmyros (Greece): II 534; VI 153
Hartmann von Aue, German poet: X 62
Helen, mother of Constantine I: III 111
Hellespont, Straits of: *see* Dardanelles
Henry I, k. Cyprus: X 65
Henry II, emp.: X 59
Henry VI of Hohenstaufen, emp., k.
 Sicily: X 67
Henry of Hainault, Latin emp. CP: VI
147–9, 151, 156–7, 164–6,
173–4, 192; X 70

Heraclea (Turkey): VI 150
Heraclius, Byz. emp.: III 124, 149;
IV 222–3
Hohenstaufen, of: *see* Frederick I,
 Frederick II, Henry VI
Holy Land: II 525, 536; III 111–12, 153;
V 32–3; X 59; *see also* Palestine
Honorius III, pope: VIII 38
Hospitaliers (Order of St. John): VIII 22;
IX 98, 110
Hugo Falcandus, historian: X 67
Huy (Belgium): X 56

Ibn al-Athir, Arab historian: X 64, 75
Ibn al-Faqih, Persian geographer: III 136
Ibn Battuta, Arab traveller: IV 230
Ibn Hayyan of Cordoba, Arab historian:
X 58
Ibn Jubayr, Arab traveller: I 93;
II 535–6, 540
Ibn Khurdadbeh, Persian geographer:
III 136
Iconium (A. M.): X 65; *see also* Konya,
Seljuk
al-Idrisi, Arab geographer: II 528, 537;
X 61, 63–4, 67
Indian Ocean: II 523
industries, manufacture (except sugar,
silk, wool, for which *see* ‘com-
modities’): III 133, 142–3;
IV 227–8; V 31–2, 39–40;
VIII 27, 30–31; IX 100, 118,
Inmestar (Syria): III 149
Innocent III, pope: V 37
Innocent IV, pope: VIII 25
Ioannina (Greece): III 120, 129
Ioannitsa, tsar Bulgaria: VI 151, 154,
160
Iran: I 89; *see also* Persia
Iraq: I 86, 89
Isabel of Ibelin, wife of Ferdinand of
 Maiorca: IX 116
Israel b. Nathan, J. resident CP: IV 224
Istria (Croatia): VI 162
Italy: I 94; II 523, 533; III 127, 137;
VI 172; VIII 17, 30; IX 98–9,
102–3, 105, 110–12, 116, 118,
120–24, 127; X 57–9, 62, 66,
70–77; XI 5–8

Jacob, Jew. merchant CP: III 149;
IV 222; XI 1–2
Jacob ben Reuben, Jew. Karaite scholar,
Byz.: XI 10
al-Jazari, Arab historian: V 39–40
Jeanne of Châtillon, wife of Walter V of

- Brienne: IX 109
- Jerome, St., Roman Church father:
III 144
- Jerusalem, city: I 84, 88, 92, 94;
III 109–11, 115–17, 124;
IV 224–7, 231; V 33–6; Latin k.
of.: VI 145, 147, 155–6, 179,
196
- Jews: I *passim*; II 521–3, 528, 530;
III *passim*; IV *passim*; V *passim*;
X 57, 64, 67; XI *passim*
- Joanna of Anjou, q. Naples: IX 97
- John I Tzimiskes, Byz. emp.: I 87;
IV 223
- John III Vatatzes, Byz. emp. Nicaea:
VI 165–6; X 72
- John Chrysostomos, bishop of CP:
III 114, 140
- John of Brienne, k. Jerusalem, later
Latin emp. CP: VI 152, 162, 165
- John of Gravina, prince Frankish Morea:
IX 116–17, 122
- John Straboromanos, Byz. governor
Crete: II 535
- Judea: III 110
- Julian the Apostate, Roman emp.: III 106
- Julius Caesar: III 109
- Justin II, Byz. emp.: III 148
- Justinian I, Byz. emp.: III 111, 118, 120,
124, 152
- Kallergis, Greek fam. Crete
Alexius: VIII 9, 24, 36, 41
- Karaites: I 87–8; III 152; IV 225–227,
231–2; V 32–4, 36, 38, 40;
XI 10–12
- Kayseri (A. M.): X 75
- Khazars: III 124–5; K. of: IV 223
- Khorasan (Iran): X 56, 75–6, 79
- Khusrau, Nassir-i, Persian traveller: I 93
- Kiev (Ukraine): V 35–6
- Kokalas, courtier of Andronic II: III 149
- Konya (A. M.): X 75
Seljuk sultan of: VI 195; *see also*
Iconium, Seljuk
- Kotychi (Pelop.) IX 124
- Kranidion (Pelop.): VIII 35
- Krisa (Greece): III 133
- Kyme (Greece): VIII 35
- La Roche, of, lords in Greece
Guy I, lord Athens: IX 107, 118,
120; X 68–9
Guy II, duke Athens: IX 108
Otto, vassal of Geoffrey I: VIII 14
- Lahijan (Iran): X 76
- Laiazzo (Cilician Armenia): X 78–9
- Lampsakos (A. M.): VI 154, 164–192,
195–8; VII 184; VIII 38
- Lanfredini, Gherardo, member of Bardi
co.: IX 116
- Langobardia, Byz. province: XI 5
- Laodicea/Laodikeia/Latakia (Syria):
I 94; IV 223
- Lascaris/Laskaris, Byz. imperial
dynasty: VI 175
Theodore I, emp.: VI 165–6, 174,
194
Theodore II, emp.: III 125
- Latakia: *see* Laodicea
- Lavra, monastery on Mount-Athos:
VI 174, 177
- Leo III, Byz. emp.: III 124; IV 223
- Leo IV, pope: X 58
- Leo VI, Byz. emp.: III 124; IV 223; XI 8
- Lesser Armenia: *see* Cilician Armenia
- Lichina (Pelop.): IX 117
- Liutprand, bishop Cremona: X 57, 59;
XI 7
- Livadostro (Greece): IX 104
- Lombards: X 79; XI 5; *see also*
Langobardia
- London: X 72
- Longo, Luca, res. CP: VII 186
Maria, his wife: VII 186
- Lotteringhi, Rinaldo, member of Bardi
co.: IX 116
- Louis IX, k. France: VII 199, 202
- Louis of Conversano, administrator,
lordship of Argos and Nauplia:
IX 122
- Louis, k. Germany: X 61
- Louis I the Pious, emp: X 56
- Low Countries: IX 112; X 55
- Luca, chancellor of Ven. podestà CP:
VI 186
- Lucca (Italy): IX 114, 120; X 56, 66,
70–79
- Luke Chrysoberges, Patriarch CP:
VIII 16
- Lycia (A. M.): I 90, 94
- Lydia (A. M.): I 84
- Macedonia: II 532
- Macrendigho (Crete): IX 124
- Macricampo/Makrikampo (A. M.):
VI 181
- Maeander, river, valley of (A. M.): I 84;
XI 15
- Maghreb: X 58, 66; *see also* Africa
- Mainetti: *see* Manetti
- Mairano, Romano, Ven. merchant:

- II 529; VII 196
 al-Makhzumi, author of Egyptian fiscal treatise: II 529, 536
 Makrembolites, Demetrios, Byz. envoy to Genoa: II 533
 Theodoros, res. CP: VIII 6
 al-Maqrizi, Arab historian: II 536
 Malloccello, Simone, Gen. consul Acre: X 78
 Mallone, Ansaldo, Gen. consul: II 532
 Mamistra (Cilician Armenia): X 79
 Mandria (Pelop.): IX 116–7
 Manetti, Sien. fam.: IX 108
 Mino, Sien. res. Chiarenza: IX 107
 Manzikert (A. M.): I 88; III 128; IV 226
 Manzolo, Matteo di, Ven. res. Melos: IX 106–7
 Marmara, sea of: III 131; VI 150
 Marocello, Bivigliano di Manetto da, member of Acciaiuoli co.: IX 117
 Marseilles: X 65, 78
 Martinacio, Giovanni, res. CP: VII 183, 185
 Giovanni, namesake, res. Venice: VII 184
 Marv (Turkmenistan): X 75
 Mary of Bourbon, titular Latin empr. CP: VIII 13; IX 122–3
 Mary of Brienne, wife of Baldwin II: VII 199–201
 Mary of Enghien, daughter of Guy, wife of Pietro Cornaro: IX 122
 Mastaura (A. M.): I 84–8; XI 15
 Matthew, St., apostle: III 108, 142
 Maximos the Confessor, St.: III 125
 Medici, de', Flor. banking co.: IX 122
 Averardo, administrator, lordship of Argos and Nauplia: IX 122
 Melings: VIII 4; *see also* Slavs
 Melitene (A. M.): I 89
 Melito of Sardis, early Church writer: III 108
 Melos/Milos, island (Greece): II 537; VIII 25, 42; IX 106–7
 Messenia (Pelop.): VI 176; VIII 3, 11–13, 15–18, 21, 23, 34, 36, 39, 41; IX 123
 Messina: IX 116; X 67, 72–3
 Metochites, Theodore, Byz. statesman: IV 228; XI 19
 Michael II, Byz. emp.: III 115
 Michael III, Byz. emp.: III 125
 Michael Italikos, Byz. writer: II 527
 Michael the Syrian, Jacobite Patriarch of Antioch: III 139
 Michiel, Ven. fam.
 Giacomo, res. Venice: VI 187;
 Giovanni, podestà CP: VII 184, 192
 migration and settlement: I 86–89;
 II 526–7, 540; III 127–9;
 IV *passim*; V 32, 37–40; VI 151, 182–9; VII *passim*; VIII 25;
 IX 98–9; X 67, 72; XI 17–20
 Milano: X 72
 Miletos (A. M.): VI 181
 Milopotamo (Crete): VIII 24
 Misito, Greek family in Pelop; VII 35
 Nicholas: VIII 8, 35
 John II: VIII 8
 Misr: *see* Cairo
 Modena: X 71–2
 Modon (Pelop.): II 525; VI 176; VIII 3, 11, 16–17, 21, 37; IX 98–9, 103, 120–21, 123, 125–6; X 77
 Molin, da, Ven. family
 Giacomo, envoy to CP: VI 167–8
 Leone, merchant: II 521–2
 Monemvasia (Pelop.): VII 191; IX 120, 127
 Montpellier: X 65, 72
 Morea, Frankish principality of: VI 168, 175, 179, 197; VII 200;
 VIII *passim*; IX *passim*; X 68, 76–7
 Morosini, Ven. Fam.
 Marino, doge: VII 187
 Albertino, podestà CP: VII 198
 Moses: III 143
 Murmurus (Mourmoures), Johannes, Greek officer, Frankish Morea: VIII 12–13
 al-Musabbihi, Arab historian: II 528
 Myconos/Mykonos, island (Greece): VIII 21; IX 122
 Myra (A. M.): I 90, 94
 Nahray b. Nissim, Jew. banker Egypt: I 91
 Nanni, Donato, res. CP: VII 193
 Giacomo, res. CP: VII 193
 Pietro, res. CP: VII 193
 Naples, city, K. of: IX 99, 106, 109, 112, 116–17, 120, 122, 124; X 58, 63, 66
 Naupactus/Naupaktos (Greece): VIII 34
 Nauplia (Pelop.): IX 98–9, 109, 122; X 68
 Navarino (Pelop.): VIII 15
 Navarra: XI 1
 Navigaioso, Paolo, Ven. res. CP: VII 186
 Giacomina, his wife: VII 186

- Naxos, island, duchy of (Greece): VIII 6;
IX 106–7, 125
- Negroponte, island (= Euboea), city of:
II 534; IV 229; VI 197;
VII 183, 188–9 192–3, 199–200;
VIII 1, 3, 6, 20, 22, 24–5, 31,
33–6, 38, 42, 44; IX 97–9,
101–3, 107–10, 114–15,
119–21; X 61, 68, 76
- Neopatras (Greece): IX 115
- Nicaea (A. M.), Byz. empire of, city:
III 125; IV 228; V 38; VIII 24;
X 62, 72, 76, 78; XI 19–20
- Nicephorus II Phocas, Byz. emp.: I 87;
IV 223
- Nicholas of Myra, St.: I 94
- Nicholas of Otranto, abbot, writer,
diplomat: V 37–8, 40
- Niketas, archbishop Chonai: III 143
- Nikolakos of Patras, Greek castellan in
Frankish Morea: VIII 12
- Nikomedeia (A. M.): VI 165
- Niola, da, Ven. family
Arnaldo (Rainaldus): res.
Negroponte: VII 189, 200
Giacomo, res. Negroponte: VII 189
Guglielmo, res. Venice: VII 188
Raimondo, brother of Arnaldo:
VII 189
Stefano, grandson of Guglielmo, res.
CP: VII 188
- Nioles: *see* Niola
- Norfolk (England): VI 188
- Normans in Italy, Sicily: X 66–7, 73;
XI 8–9, 17
- North Africa: II 529; *see* Maghreb
- Notker Balbulus, historian: X 56–7
- Oderzo (Italy): VI 162
- Odo, abbot Cluny: X 57
- Ohrid (Macedonia): III 132
- Oikos (A. M.): VI 165–6, 179
- Oria (Italy): III 130; X 66
- Orio, Ven. family
Giovanni, merchant: II 526
Pietro, merchant: II 525
- Orléans: X 56
- Orseolo, Ottone, Ven. doge: X 57
- Orsini, Riccardo, count Cephalonia:
VIII 13
- Otranto (Italy): X 66
- Palaeologus, Byz. imperial dynasty:
IV 229; XI 18, 20
Andronicus II, emp.: III 129, 149;
IV 229; V 37
- John VIII, emp.: VIII 25
- Michael VIII, emp.: III 131;
IV 228–9; V 37, 39–40; VI 148
- Palermo: X 61, 65, 67, 70, 73
- Palestine: I 86–7, 92; III 105–6, 110,
112–13, 118, 129, 133, 151,
153; IV 222, 228, 231; *see also*
Holy Land
- Paphlagonia (A. M.): V 38
- Paris (France): VII 200
- Partecipazio, Ven. fam.
Giustiniano, doge: X 57
Orso, bishop Olivolo: X 57
- Patmos, island (Greece): II 521; VIII 27,
40, 42
- Patras (Pelop.): VIII 17; IX 99, 101–3,
114–15, 120–21; X 61, 68, 77
- Paul, St., apostle: III 107
- Pavia: X 56–8
- peasantry: III 133; VI 152, 170,
174–182; VIII 4, 6, 10–17,
20–24, 26, 30
- Pedro IV, k. Aragon: IX 110
- Pegolotti, Francesco Balducci, author of
trade manual: II 538; IX 104
- Peloponnese: II 519, 525, 529, 531, 533,
537; VIII *passim*; IX *passim*;
XI 13
- Pera, suburb of CP: III 122, 131, 150;
IV 225, 227–30; V 31–3, 36–9;
XI 17
- Peruzzi, Flor. banking co.: IX 115–16
Mazzetto: IX 115
- Persia, Persians, Sasanian: III 116, 119;
X 58, 64, 75; XI 5; *see also*
Iran
- Persian Gulf: I 89
- Petoni (Pelop.): IX 124–5
- Petrone da Siena, res. Chiarenza: IX 107
- Petrus Damiani, cardinal: X 60
- Philanthropenos, Alexios, Byz. general:
III 122
- Philip I of Taranto, husband of Catherine
of Valois, prince Frankish
Morea: IX 116
- Philip II, k. France: II 537
- Philip of Courtenay, son of Baldwin II,
titular Latin emp. of CP:
VII 200–201
- Philip of Savoy, prince Frankish Morea:
IX 106
- Philippopolis (= Plovdiv, Bulgaria):
II 527
- Phocis (Greece): X 56
- Phoenicia: V 35
- Photios, Greek archon in Pelop.: IX 127

- Phrygia (A. M.): III 142; IV 227
 Piacenza: VII 200; IX 107, 112
 Piccolimini, Sien. family: IX 108
 Pietro IV Candiano, Ven. doge: XI 7
 Pietro, Donato, res. CP: VII 193
 Piacenza: IX 107
 pilgrimage, pilgrims: I 90, 93; II 530;
 X 59, 63, 65
 Pilla (Pelop.): IX 125
 Pino, Judo, Ven. res. CP: VII 191–2
 Piper, Lanfranco, Gen. consul: II 532
 Pisa, Pisans: II 532; V 39; IX 101,
 111–12, 120; X 67, 76–7, 79
 Pistello, Domenico, res. CP: VII 185
 Planoudes, Maximos, Byz. scholar: V 39
 Pliny the Elder, Roman naturalist and
 writer: XI 11
 Po, river: VI 161
 Prato (Italy): IX 114
 Prodomos, Theodore, Byz. poet: II 527;
 see also Ptochoprodromos
 Propontis: *see* Marmara
 Provence, Provençaux: VII 188; X 72, 79
 Psellos, Michael, Byz. writer: I 95
 Ptochoprodromos, Byz. poet: II 527; *see*
 also Prodomos, Theodore
- Qilidj Arslan II, Seljuk sultan Iconium:
 X 75
 Quartier, Lise du, noble lady in Morea:
 IX 106
 Querini, Ven. fam.
 Giberto, res. CP, later Venice:
 VI 167, 169, 171, 183–7,
 190–91, 201; VII 184–5, 192,
 194–6, 203
 Giberto, namesake, res. Corfu:
 VI 184
 Giovanni, son of Paolo I, res. CP:
 VI 169, 183–4, 187, 201
 Leonardo, patriarch Grado, brother
 of Giberto I: VI 183, 185;
 VII 184–5, 195
 Niccolò, son of Giberto I, res. CP:
 VI 184, 186–8; VII 184–6
 Niccolò, namesake, res. CP:
 VII 193–4, 197–8, 203
 Ottaviano, podestà CP: VII 183
 Paolo I, brother of Giberto I, res. CP,
 later Venice: VI 167, 169,
 183–4, 187, 201
 Paolo, namesake, envoy to CP:
 VI 183
 Pietro, son of Giberto I, res. CP, later
 Venice: VI 184, 186–8;
 VII 184–5
- Radhanites: XI 5
 Reynald of Châtillon, prince Antioch:
 X 63
 Ranfredo, Bonifacio di: II 532
 Red Sea: I 89
 Rhaidestos/Rodosto (Turkey):
 VI 150–51, 154, 158–60, 177–8,
 181–2, 190, 192–3, 195–6;
 VII 197
 Rhine, river: X 60
 Rhodes, island (Greece): II 519, 523,
 525, 535, 537; III 127; VIII 22,
 24; IX 125
 Riccardi, Lucchese banking co.: IX 114
 Riccio, Ogerio, Gen. consul Acre: X 78
 Richard I, k. England: II 537
 Robert of Taranto, prince Morea, titular
 Latin emp. CP, son of Philip I
 and Catherine of Valois: IX 117
 Robert of Courtenay, Latin emp. CP:
 VI 148
 Rodosto: *see* Rhaidestos
 Roger II, k. Sicily: II 528; X 66–7
 Roger of Hoveden, English historian:
 II 540
 Romano, Marco, Ven. res. CP: VII 186
 Romanus I Lecapenus, Byz. emp.:
 III 125; IV 223
 Rome, city, Roman emp.: III 110, 118;
 V 37; X 56, 58, 60
 Rum, Rumi (= Byzantium, Christian
 West, Christians and Jews from
 Christian lands): I 85, 89, 93;
 II 528; *see also* Seljuks
 Russia, Russians: V 32, 34–6
 Rustichino, Azzolino, Sien. banker res.
 Negroponte: IX 108–11, 114;
 see also Piccolimini
- Saladin, sultan Egypt: X 64
 Salerno: X 57
 Salmaza, Benedetto de, res. CP: VII 196
 Salomon II, bishop Constance: X 61
 Salomon the Egyptian, Jew. physician of
 Manuel I: IV 227; V 32
 Salomon, k. Israel: III 116
 Samaritans: III 119, 126
 San Marco d'Alunzio (Sicily): X 67
 Santo Archangelo (Pelop.): IX 126
 Sanudo, Ven. fam.
 Angelo, duke Naxos: IX 107
 Marco I, duke Naxos: VIII 6, 35
 Marino 'the Elder', historian, author
 of crusading treatise: VIII
 24–5, 41; IX 113
 Saraceni, de', Sien. fam.: IX 110

- Agnes, daughter of Saraceno, wife of Nerio I Acciaiuoli: IX 110
 Elabruccio, res. Thebes: IX 110
 Pietro, son of Saraceno: IX 110
 Saraceno, res. Negroponte: IX 110
 Sassi, Agostino, Sien. (?) banker: IX 109
 Satalia, de: Nicola: X 75–6
 Raimondo: X 75
 see also Attaleia
 Scali, Flor. banking co.: IX 114
 Scotto, Sien. banking co.: VII 200, 203; IX 112
 Andrea, merchant, res. CP: VII 199
 Bonencontre, merchant: VII 199
 Giovanni, merchant, res. CP: VII 199
 Niccolò, merchant, res. CP: VII 199
 Seljuks: I 88–9; IV 226–7; V 33; X 61, 65, 75–6
 Seleucia (A. M.): I 85, 92, 95
 Shahidan (Afghanistan): X 75
 Sicily: II 528, 530, 534, 536–7; IV 228; VI 172; VIII 29–30; IX 119; X 66–7, 70, 72–5, 77; XI 8–9, 17
 Siena, Sienese: VII 199–201; IX 108–14, 118, 126
 Signolo, Ven. fam.
 Domenico, res. CP: VI 160, 164
 Giorgio, res. CP: VII 193, 196
 Sivas (A. M.): X 75
 Skorta (Pelop.): VIII 13, 31
 Slavs: VIII 3–6; *see also* Melings
 Soranzo, Antonio, Ven. podestà CP: VII 191
 Spadario, Otto, res. CP: VII 194–5
 Spain: III 128; X 55, 58, 61, 66, 73; XI 1
 Sparta (Pelop.): II 528; III 123, 147, 149; VIII 27; IX 100
 Sperone (Pelop.): IX 116–17, 124
 St. George of Skorta (Pelop.): VIII 12–13
 St. Goar, monastery (Germany): X 59
 Staniaro, Ven. fam.
 Maria (Mariota), wife of Zaccaria: VII 182
 Zaccaria, res. CP: VII 182, 185
 Stephen the Martyr, St.: II 526
 Storlato, Marino, Ven. envoy to CP, later podestà CP: VI 163, 168
 Strobilos (A. M.): I 90
 Succugullo, Ven. fam.
 Giovanni, res. CP: VI 167, 169, 187–8, 201
 Leonardo, res. Venice, VI 188
 Marco, son of Stefano, res. Venice: VI 188
 Pantaleone, res. CP: VI 188
 Stefano, res. Venice, VI 188
 Sulimanus, Basilius, res. CP: VII 191
 Demetrius, from Monemvasia, res. CP: VII 191
 Symeon the Stylite the Elder, St.: III 123
 Synnada (A. M.): III 142
 Syria, Syrians: I 86–8, 93; II 524, 530–31; III 107–8, 110, 113, 116; IV 223–4, 228, 230; VII 185; X 59
 Tabriz (Iran): X 75, 79
 Tancredi, Meo, res. Chiarenza: IX 113
 taxation: II 524, 526, 529, 532, 536, 539; VI 170, 174–182; VIII 10–17, 20–23; IX 99, 120; X 58, 63, 65, 68–9, 76
 Taygetus, Mount (Pelop.): VIII 4
 Tenos/ Tinos, island (Greece): VIII 21; IX 122
 Terraferma, continental hinterland of Venice: VI 145; *see* Veneto
 Tertullianus, Roman Church father: III 108
 Thebes (Greece): II 524, 527; III 133, 147; IV 228; V 37–8; VI 188; VIII 27; IX 100–102, 104–5, 107, 110, 114–15, 118–19; X 61–2, 66–70, 77; XI 1, 8–9, 12–13, 17
 Theodosius II, Byz. emp.: III 113, 123, 127, 130, 144; IV 221
 Theodulf, bishop Orléans: X 56
 Theophylactus, bishop of Ohrid/of Bulgaria: VIII 20
 Thessalonica: I 88, 92; III 127–8, 133, 149; IV 227, 231; V 33–8; VIII 15; IX 101; X 76; XI 1, 9–10, 12–13
 fair of St. Demetrios at: V 35
 Thessaly: II 522, 532; VIII 20; IX 108; X 63
 Thibaud V, count Champagne: VI 189
 Thrace: I 90; II 527, 532; V 38; VI 150–51, 153, 164–6
 Tiepolo, Ven. family
 Giacomo, podestà CP, later doge: VI 158, 160, 163, 169–71, 177, 188, 192–5, 201; VII 190
 Lorenzo, doge: VI 161, 166; VII 202; IX 122
 Tinnis (Egypt): I 85; X 64
 Titino, Ven. family
 Domenico, merchant: II 526
 Michele, merchant: II 525–6

- Tobias b. Moses, Jew. res. CP, later
Jerusalem: IV 225
- Toledo (Spain): X 72
- Tolomei, Sien. banking co.: IX 110,
112–14, 116
- Diego, res Frankish Morea:
IX 116–17
- Vanne di Tese, res. Siena: IX 110, 112
- Toscano, Bernardo, leaseholder in
Frankish Morea: IX 123
- trade and shipping: I 88–95; II *passim*;
III 135–7; IV 222, 224;
V 34–6; VI 177–8, 182, 190;
VII 181–90, 198–204;
VIII 14–15, 27–32; IX *passim*;
X *passim*; XI 2–7, 14–19
- Trebizond (A. M.): I 89; X 75, 79
- Trevisano, Olurado, res. CP: VII 195
- Tripoli (Lebanon): I 93; X 65
- Tumba, da, Ven. family
Giovanni, res. CP: VII 193
Stefano, res. CP: VII 191
- Tunis: X 73
- Tunisia: X 58
- Turks: IX 104, 121, 124
- Tyre (Lebanon): V 33; VI 145, 152,
155–6, 196; X 56, 64, 77
- Tzetzes, John, Byz. poet: III 150
- Uguccio da Chiarenza: IX 112
- Valencia (Spain): X 65, 73
- Vasilika (Pelop.): IX 124
- Vassilopoulos, Greek officer, Frankish
Morea: VIII 12
- Vendilino, Leonardo, Ven. res. CP:
VI 160, 164
- Veneto: VI 162; *see also* Terraferma
- Venice, Venetians: I 94; II 518–19,
521–2, 524–6, 529–30, 538,
540; IV 229–30; V 34–5, 39–40;
VI *passim*; VII 182–6, 188,
194–5, 198–9, 201–2, 204;
VIII *passim*; IX 98–9, 101–3,
105–8, 110–11, 119–22;
X 57–8, 62–5, 68, 74–7, 79;
XI 5–7
- Venier, Ven. family
Antonio, doge: IX 104
- Giacomo, merchant: II 529; VII 188
- Giovanni, res. CP: VII 186–7
- Marco, son of Giovanni: VII 187–8,
193; VIII 36
- Michele, res. CP: VI 164
- Stefano, son of Giovanni: VII 187–8
- Vitale, res. CP: VII 191
- Zoe, wife of Marco: VIII 36
- Vervena (Pelop.): VIII 31; IX 127
- Vienna (Austria): X 66
- Vignari, Sien. family: IX 110
- Villehardouin, of
Geoffrey I, prince Frankish Morea:
VIII 14, 44; IX 104; X 68
- Isabel, daughter of William II:
VIII 7; IX 105–6
- William II, prince Frankish Morea:
VIII 7, 42; IX 97, 103, 107,
112–13
- Viviani, Guccio, Sien. banker: IX 110;
see Vignari
- Viviano, Giacomo, notary CP: VII 194–5
- Vlachs: II 522, 527
- Volta, della: Genoese fam.: IX 117
- Volturno (Italy): X 66
- Walter of Châtillon, father of Jeanne of
Châtillon: IX 110
- Walter V, Count of Brienne and Lecce,
Duke of Athens: IX 108–9
- Walter VI, son of Walter V: IX 109
- William, archbishop Tyre, historian:
X 64
- William II, k. Sicily: X 74
- Yehuda ben Elijah Hadassi, Jew. Karaite
scholar, Byz.: XI 10
- al-Zahir, Fatimid caliph Egypt: I 90
- Zara (= Zadar, Croatia): VI 178
- Zane, Pietro, Ven.: VII 198
- Zeno, Ven. fam.
Marino, podestà CP: VI 146–9,
153–6, 161, 185, 193–5
- Ranier, doge: VI 153; VII 204
- Ziani, Pietro, Ven. doge: VI 158, 167,
169, 177, 183–4, 192; VII 190
- Zorzi, Marsilio, Ven. bailo Acre: VI 156
- al-Zuhri, Arab geographer: II 529

